DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 738 EA 015 588

AUTHOR King, A. L.
TITLE Ways to Improve Schools and Education. Final Interim Report.
INSTITUTION Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 30 Nov 82
CONTRACT 400-80-0107
NOTE 142p.; Portions of text may not reproduce well. For a related document, see EA 015 589.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Compliance (Legal); Desegregation Litigation; *Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Integration; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Multicultural Education; *School Desegregation; School Districts
IDENTIFIERS Arkansas; Louisiana; Mississippi; New Mexico; Oklahoma; Texas

ABSTRACT

Examined here was the inclusion of educational components in court-ordered desegregation plans in the Southwest Educational Developoment Laboratory (SEDL) region (Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas). These components included inservice education, multicultural education, and eight others. Researchers hypothesized that court-ordered desegregation plans in this region do not specify educational components in sufficient detail for use by desegregating or desegregated schools and districts. Likewise, school district plans do not contain sufficient detail about educational components for courts to decide whether the district is in compliance. Data were collected by examining desegregation court orders and district plans for 15 sites in the SEDL region. Interviews and observations were used at two sites. Comparative and descriptive analysis of the data supported the project hypothesis. Little detail was included in the desegregation plans except for reassignment of pupils and, to a lesser extent, of staff. Researchers concluded that, although it is not to be expected that full-blown inservice or multicultural programs will be embodied in desegregation court orders or district plans, orders and plans should specify that there will be desegregation-specific training and multiethnic programs and indicate general outlines and content of the programs. A companion document provides a brief summary of the study. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David L. Williams, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FINAL INTERIM REPORT

WAYS TO IMPROVE SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION

SOUTHWEST EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY
AUSTIN, TEXAS

NIE CONTRACT NO. 400-80-0107

EA 015 588

November 30, 1982

Mr. Oscar Uribe
Project Officer
Desegregation Studies Team
National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20208

Dear Mr. Uribe:

Enclosed is the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory's final interim report for the Ways to Improve Schools and Education Project. The report is being forwarded as part of the terms and conditions set forth in NIE Contract No. 400-80-0107, Modification 5. It covers the work period of December 1, 1981 through November 30, 1982.

Should there be a need for additional information please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

David L. Williams, Jr.

David L. Williams, Jr. (Dr.)
Director
Division of Family, School
and Community Studies

jm
Enclosures

xc: Dr. Preston C. Kronkosky
Mr. Arnold W. Kriegel
Mr. Roan Garcia-Quintana
Mr. Raymond Wormwood
DFSCS Advisory Board
WISE Staff

FINAL INTERIM REPORT

PROJECT: WAYS TO IMPROVE SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION (WISE)

Division of Family, School and Community Studies (DFSCS)

Senior Researcher: Dr. A. L. King

Staff: Christina Fernandez
Research Assistant

Sylvia Lewis*
Administrative Secretary

*Part time

In Compliance with Contract No.: 400-80-107

Funded by: National Institute of Education (NIE)
Washington, D.C.

Project Period: December 1, 1981 through November 30, 1982

David L. Williams, Jr., Division Director

Preston C. Kronkosky, Executive Director
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL)
Austin, Texas

Produced by Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, a private non-profit laboratory, and supported by funds from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

(c) 1982, by Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
Austin, Texas

ABSTRACT

The goal of Project WISE (Ways to Improve Schools and Education) in 1982 has been to produce a set of findings and recommendations with regard to the inclusion of educational components in court-ordered desegregation plans. The list of components, developed from previous work by the Project and from the literature, contains:

(1) Inservice education,
(2) Curriculum,
(3) Discipline,
(4) Extracurricular activities,
(5) Counseling & career guidance,
(6) Multi-cultural education,
(7) Magnet schools,
(8) Quality of education,
(9) Local needs/conditions,
(10) Parent involvement or community relations.
(11) Student reassignment
(12) Staff reassignment

Sets of desegregation court orders and district plans were collected for 15 sites in the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory six-state region (Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas). Sites were selected on the basis of criteria developed to assure certain demographic and geographic variety rather than for similar characteristics. The sites are bi-ethnic (Black-White and Hispanic-Anglo) and tri-ethnic (Black-Hispanic-Anglo and Black-Native American-Anglo), as well as urban, suburban, and rural. Student enrollments range from about 50,000 to about 4,000.

The 15 sets of plans and orders were examined for inclusion/omission of the 12 educational components and for student and staff desegregation components. A total of 105 techniques as specified in the plans and/or orders to implement the 12 components are listed under the appropriate components. Examination of the documents was facilitated by a Checklist

developed by Project staff. The plans and court orders were also compared with the Ways to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools Project's Guidelines for Desegregation, Multi-cultural Education and Inservice Education.

Additional information about implementation of two of the plans was gathered at their sites by observations of inservice training and interviews with school staff. Four attorneys who have been involved in the sites' desegregation suits were also interviewed.

Comparative and descriptive analysis of the data supported the Project hypothesis. Little detail was included in the desegregation plans except for reassignment of pupils and, to a lessor extent, of staff. Most of the plans made no reference to inservice training. Six indicated that there would be training in one or two content areas. These included: (1) human relations; (2) cultural awreness, stereotyping, and race relations; (3) evaluation and use of multi-ethnic materials; (4) social studies; and (5 & 6) orientation and training to implement desegregation.

Multi-cultural education was included in the plans only to a limited extent and as portions of other components, as inservice and curriculum. Some intent was expressed in the plans with regard to parent involvement and community relations. "Quality of education" was mentioned in two court orders and four plans. In some contexts it was a statement of commitment either to maintain or improve quality. In three of the plans, some specific techniques were specified to improve it, as by reducing the teacher-pupil ratio (in magnet schools only). Magnet schools were used in three of the districts. Use of the components and techniques are discussed with regard to bi-ethnic and tri-ethnic settings.

The report concludes that, although a great deal is known about successful desegregation policies and practices, relatively little of this knowledge is reflected in desegregation court orders and plans. As expected, the plans contained more content on educational components than did the court orders. It is not to be expected that full-blown inservice programs will be embodied in desegregation court orders or district plans. It does appear that orders and plans should specify that there will be desegregation-specific training and indicate general outlines and content of the program. Project recommendations for more research include the areas of: (1) second generation desegregation problems, (2) desegregation of non-Black minorities, (3) multi-ethnic desegregation, (4) bilingual education and desegregation, (5) diffusion of successful desegregation practices to desegregating/desegregated schools where needed, and (6) implications of successful desegregation-related practices to general education policies and processes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ABSTRACT		i
A.	INTRODUCTION	1
	1. Rationale	1
	2. Literature Review	2
	3. Statement of the Problem	13
	4. Goal and Objectives	13
	5. Limitations	14
	6. Research Questions	16
	7. Definitions	16
B.	METHODOLOGY	19
	1. Description of Documents	19
	2. Description of Instruments	25
	3. Procedures	26
C.	RESULTS	33
	1. Description of Techniques Used	33
	2. Discussion of the Findings	34
D.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	66
	1. Discussion of Results with Regard to Research Questions	66
	2. Conclusions	83
	3. Recommendations	86
E.	REFERENCES	87
F.	APPENDICES	
	a. Project Wise Checklist	117
	b. Table 4: Desegregation Techniques Used by Component and Grade Level	121
	4-A Elementary	
	4-B Junior High/Middle School	
	4-C High School	
	4-D All Levels	

List of Tables

1.	Demographic Data of Fifteen LEA Sites for Analysis of Desegregation Court Orders and Plans	22
2.	School Population Ethnicity Changes	23
3.	List of Desegregation Techniques (by Component) Used by at Least One of Fifteen Districts	27

List of Tables (cont'd)

		Page
4.	Desegregation Techniques Used by Component and Grade Level. . . 4-A Elementary 4-B Junior High/Middle School 4-C High School 4-D All Levels	121
5.	Educational Components and Frequency of Use	67
6.	Frequencies of Use of Techniques within Components (omitting Student and Faculty Reassignment) By Ethnic Groups of Districts	68
7.	District Desegregation Plans for Multi-cultural Education Compared with WIEDS Guidelines for Multi-cultural Education . .	74
8.	District Plans for Desegregation Compared with WIEDS Guidelines for Desegregation	77
9.	District Plans for Inservice Education Compared with WIEDS Guidelines for Inservice Education.	82

A. INTRODUCTION

In Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka (1954) the issue was not, strictly speaking, an educational one. The question in Brown was whether segregation itself deprives Black children of equal opportunity. The issues addressed in Brown were constitutional, moral, and philosophical rather than educational. A major theme of more than 25 years of federal court decisions has been that the courts' function is to end racial isolation and it is the responsibility of educators and school boards to run the schools.

During the past 20 years, however, judicial remedies to provide equality of educational opportunity have become extremely complex, involving far more than a mere mixing of races. In areas with high proportions of minority populations, it is difficult to desegregate schools. Further, it became apparent that many children need remedial and compensatory education, and courts began to consider this in questions of educational equity. Their decisions have often had considerable impact on school policies and programs.

1. Rationale

The involvement of federal courts in local school policies and practices is a controversial subject. Whether courts should be thus involved is undoubtedly an important question. It is not, however, the question addressed by The Ways to Improve Schools and Education Project (hereafter referred to as WISE or the Project). This project is concerned with providing information and guidelines for the improvement of education in desegregated or desegregating schools. Desegregation court orders and plans will be examined and recommendations will be made.

There is still much to be done with respect to resolving the issues surrounding school desegregation and educational equity. Many schools still need assistance in providing children with basic skills education. All children need the benefits of multi-cultural education which reflects and prepres them for the culturally pluralistic nature of our society. It may be that courts will continue to play a role in this process. Preferably, solutions will come through local or state initiative. In any case, more information and skills are needed by those who have the responsibility of providing quality education for a diverse population of children. Guidelines consistent with sound educational practices are needed for the development and implementation of effective education in a multi-cultural school setting.

2. Literature Review

Although this study pertains primarily to desegregation of selected schools in the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) six-state region (Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas), the issues involved can be better understood when seen in a broad historical context of common law development in the United States, Anglo-Saxon England, and western culture. Legal and constitutional aspects in the background of this study can perhaps be more clearly understood as part of two questions with deep historical roots: (1) the role of "the state" in education and (2) educational equity as it pertains to racial and ethnic groups.

From ancient Greece and Rome through early Anglo-Saxon history, the responsibility of parents, more particularly the father, for the education of their children can be traced. As the state's interest in promoting an

orderly society and the common welfare of its citizens gradually increased, parents' prerogatives in the education of their progeny decreased. Compulsory school attendance laws accelerated this process in the U.S., which process began early in colonial Massachusetts. Influenced by Calvinist doctrine upon the individual's responsibility for salvation, Massachusetts Bay Colony enacted compulsory education in two laws (1642 and 1647) so that all persons therein could read the Bible, imposing a fine for neglect of education and requiring all towns of 50 or more families to provide a teacher for reading and writing. Ultimately, each of the 50 states enacted statuatory provisions that children must attend schools.

a. Federal Court Desegregation Decisions Affecting Educational Programs

With a federal system embodied in its Constitution and Bill of Rights, the U. S. has a national government of certain delegated powers, and state governments with all other powers, not prohibited by the Constitution, reserved to them. Whether these reserved powers enabled a state to require "all normal" children to attend public, rather than private or parochial, schools was decided in 1925. In The Oregon Case (268 U. S., 510, 1925), the U. S. Supreme Court went beyond the issue of whether the plaintiffs (private and parochial school authorities) would be forced by the state to abandon their livelihoods. The issue of parents' rights to have a choice of where their children went to school was examined. The Court ruled that a parent could satisfy the state's compulsory attendance law by placing the child in a private or parochial school, so long as that school met reasonable state laws pertaining to curriculum and other aspects of a school program.

Whether a state had the right to segregate public facilities by race was questioned in Louisiana, one of a number of southern states which required separate public accommodations. In Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) the U. S. Supreme Court upheld a Louisiana law requiring segregated railroad facilities. As long as equality of accommodations existed, the Court held in a five-to-four decision, separate facilities did not constitute discrimination, and Blacks were not deprived of equal protection of the laws under the Fourteenth Amendment. Southern states extended this "separate but equal" doctrine to education, requiring Black and White children to attend racially segregated schools.

In 1954, sixteen southern states--including all six in the SEDL region--and the District of Columbia required racially segregated schools. In that year, in Brown et al. v. The Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas et al. (347 U. S. 483, 1954), the Supreme Court recognized the "separate but equal" doctrine but reasoned that the schools in question were not and could not be equal. They ordered that the plaintiff Black children admitted to previously all-White schools. The Court was persuaded by testimony for the plaintiffs that social and psychological factors had to be considered. The decision reflected this testimony, e.g.:

> To separate children from others of similar age and qualifications solely on the basis of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community in a way unlikely ever to be undone.

and:

> We believe that segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the facilities and other tangible factors may be equal, deprives minority children of equal educational opportunities.

Segregation by race, said a unanimous Court, is "inherently unequal."

In a second hearing the next year (Brown II, 1955), the Court directed lower courts to "take such proceedings and enter such orders and decrees consistent with this opinion as are necessary and proper to admit to schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis with all deliberate speed...."

The Brown decision may be seen as another step in the progression of the state's enhancement of the general welfare at the expense of traditional rights of individual states and parents. Even so, it was a large step with revolutionary effects not only in education, but also in society and politics. Since Brown I, in 1954, there have been several more or less distinct periods in the socio-legal history of desegregation as it has ebbed and flowed. (Several good summary reviews of federal court decisions help delineate these periods, at least to 1976: Kirp, May 1977; Jones, 1979; Smith 1975; Read, 1975; and Browning, 1975.) A review of major decisions indicates periods of federal court actions which vary according to (1) delay tactics by desegregation opponents, (2) types of segregation and social conditions in urban and rural areas and regions of the country, (3) arguments by plaintiffs, and (4) approaches by the courts. A brief description of these five periods follows.

1954-1955. Between Brown decisions I and II, was a year of waiting to find out what remedy the Supreme Court was going to fashion after finding that school racial segregation was inherently unequal and thus unconstitutional. The Court's order to lower federal courts to "take such proceedings and enter such orders and decrees...as are necessary and proper...with all deliberate speed" gave little in the way of implementation guidelines for timing or substance.

1956-1963. This was a period of tension in southern states. Federal marshalls, and sometimes federal troops, tried to enforce district court remedies for minority plaintiffs. State legislatures passed anti-desegregation laws and school districts delayed through the use of counter suits, tokenism, and up-grading of Black schools to make them equal to those of Whites. These tactics required even more adjudication and time, as federal courts eventually found most of the laws and tactics to be in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment.

1964-1967. This three-year period was a time of considerable desegregation in southern public schools. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 gave the U.S. Office of Education significant responsibility, authority, and financial resources to implement school desegregation. With funding under Title IV of the Act, many districts began to receive extensive training and other technical assistance in desegregating their schools. Further, Title VI of the Act prohibits racial discrimination in any program receiving federal funds. Guidelines from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) provided school officials some direction in implementing desegregation.

1968-1973. During this period, desegregation efforts of the national executive branch increased and then slowed considerably, while those of the judicial branch increased significantly. As noted by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (August 1976), between May 1969 and February 1971 the files of 60 school districts were transferred by HEW to the Department of Justice for legal action to enforce desegregation. Between February 1971 and June 1973, no such files were transferred nor was any action sought. The burden was again on individuals or civil rights groups to take legal action

against segregation. Federal courts were more receptive than ever to such action. In Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, Virginia (1968) the Supreme Court examined and rejected the "freedom-of-choice" desegregation plan. The decision stated: "Freedom of choice is not a sacred talisman; it is only a means of a constitutionally required end - the abolition of the system of segregation and its efforts." The Court concluded that it was the school board's duty to "come forth with a plan that promises realistically to work now." "Freedom-of-choice" did not do that.

In 1969, the Court again showed its impatience with delay. It formally ended the Brown doctrine of "all deliberate speed" by holding that delays in the desegregation process were "no longer constitutionally permissible" (Alexander v. Holmes County Board of Education, 1969). Two years later, this Court reviewed the concept of "neighborhood schools." In Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education (North Carolina, 1971) the Court examined a 1965 plan that had failed to desegregate the large, combined city-county district and ordered a new plan. The Court rejected the district's revised plan, based largely on a "neighborhood schools" concept. The district had, the Court found, closed some schools and built others to keep Black and White neighborhoods segregated. The Court said:

> All things being equal, with no history of discrimination, it might be desirable to assign pupils to schools nearest their homes. But all things are not equal in a system that has been deliberately constructed and maintained to enforce racial segregation. The remedy for such segregation may be administratively awkward, inconvenient, and even bizarre in some situations, but all awkwardness and inconvenience cannot be avoided when remedial adjustments are being made....

One remedial adjustment in Swann was bus transportation: "In these circumstances we find no basis for holding that the local school

authorities may not be required to employ bus transportation as one tool of school desegregation." Large-scale busing was sanctioned. Other controversial Swann remedies included: (1) validation of the use of racial factors and mathematical ratios in student and teacher assignments as a "useful starting point," (2) disallowance of any student transfer which would have the effect of increasing the imbalance in either of the affected schools, (3) use of a court-appointed expert to draw up an acceptable plan, (4) no school would have a majority of Black pupils, and (5) a declaration of broad judicial powers:

> If school authorities fail in their affirmative obligations..., judicial authority may be invoked. Once a right and a violation have been shown, the scope of a District Court's equitable powers to remedy past wrongs is broad, for breadth and flexibility are inherent in equitable remedies.

1973-1982. This period has been and remains a time in which the courts' breadth and flexibility of remedies have been tested. In 1973 the first Supreme Court case for a "northern" school district was heard, Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado. No Colorado law had ever mandated racial segregation of schools; nevertheless, the Court ruled that schools in a section of Denver were unconstitutionally segregated as a result of state and local decisions. Through the adjustment of attendance boundaries, selection of building sites and mobile classrooms, and design of feeder patterns to secondary schools, the Court found, the Denver school board had confined its growing Black population (8,000 to 45,000 from 1940 to 1966) to a narrow corridor. This was, said the Court, sufficient state action to constitute de jure segregation. On the basis of expert testimony, the Court concluded that "the only feasible and constitutionally acceptable (remedy)--the only program which furnishes anything approaching

substantial equality"--was desegregation "combined with an intense and massive compensatory education program." It was now clear that not only might forceful remedies of Alexander and Swann be applied in school districts outside the South, but equitable remedy could include court-ordered changes in the schools.

After the Keyes decision, other suits filed in the northern and western sections of the country moved forward. Crucial to these decisions was the question of how racial balance stipulating that no school have a majority of Black pupils could be applied to a district with a majority of Black pupils, as in Detroit. A federal district court in Detroit approved a "metropolitan" plan which would desegregate Detroit schools with those in predominantly White suburbs. The district court found that both the State of Michigan and the City of Detroit had violated Brown I principles in "confining Black children to an expanding core of state-imposed Black schools" (Bradley v. Milliken, 1974). The district judge designated Detroit and 53 suburban school districts as the "desegregation area" and ordered a plan to desegregate it. The appeals court agreed that this metropolitan plan was within the court's equity powers and essential to remedy the de jure segregation in Detroit.

The appellate court ruled, however, that the suburban districts had to have a hearing. In reviewing the decision, the Supreme Court upheld the findings of de jure segregation in Detroit. But by a five-to-four vote, the Court rejected the proposed remedy, ruling that it was beyond the remedial powers of the federal courts because no metropolitan wrong had been established. No metropolitan wrong, no metropolitan remedy.

The Supreme Court held in Milliken that the lower courts had erred in their belief that a majority-Black school system could not be constitutionally desegregated within that district. The Court stated that districts in Michigan are autonomous political agencies, and thus unconstitutional actions affecting other districts had to be demonstrated in each school district included in the interdistrict remedy.

Emphasis on South-North differences and de facto-de jure differences have perhaps been over-emphasized; de jure segregation has been proved outside the South. With so many cities of the North and South having mostly a minority population, differences appear to be more urban-rural. It appears that attempts to answer these questions may have brought about the courts' emphasis on "educational components" or ancillary remedies in largely minority districts. When the Supreme Court ruled against the first Bradley v. Milliken remedy of interdistrict desegregation, that district's court formulated a Detroit-only plan that included a number of compensatory and ancillary educational components which were far more sweeping and larger in scope than those ordered in Denver.

b. Research Related to Educational Components in Desegregation

By both its supporters and detractors, school desegregation has been controversially related to political, legal, and social issues of minority rights, majority rights, individual rights, states' rights, local control, and general welfare. But above all, school desegregation has been tied to education. This section of the literature review deals with educational components in desegregation, omitting the considerable controversy over the appropriate role of judges, particularly federal judges, in education.

The pace and volume of research related to desegregation has increased over the past decade and a half. It was already considerable in 1967, when Meyer Weinberg published his School Integration: A Comprehensive Classified Bibliography of 3,100 References. Three years later he published a second edition (1970) to cover the research between 1967 and 1969. In 1977 Weinberg added another review volume, Minority Students: A Research Appraisal (March 1977), as well as contributing his original research in A Chance to Learn: A History of Race and Education in the United States (1977). In 1976, the National Institute of Education reviewed approximately 1,500 items as a sample from which basic trends in the literature could be ascertained (July 1976). In their own investigation, as well as in their analysis of the research of others, Weinberg (Winter 1977), Pettigrew (1971) and others pointed out the need for, and the benefits of, desegregation for majority as well as minority students, and called for school improvements to meet students' needs. Research by others, such as Armour (Summer 1972; 1972) and Jencks et al. (1972), was emphasizing the damaging influences of low socio-economic status and poor home conditions and asserting that schools could do little to overcome these factors.

In her important meta-analysis, St. John (1975) reviewed the methodology and findings of 120 reports on the effects of desegregation on children. She stressed the complex, multifaceted nature of desegregation which, under various conditions she identified, could have either positive or negative results for children. St. John probably helped to improve the general quality and productivity of subsequent desegregation research.

Many of the results of recent research are reported on in the extensive and helpful nine-volume Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies by Hawley et al. (April 1981). Although even this series of nine reports is not exhaustive, each volume provides useful information in the area indicated by its title: I, Strategies for Desegregation: A Synthesis of Findings; II, An Agenda for Further Research on Desegregation Strategies; III, A Proposed National Study of School Desegregation; IV, A Practical Guide to Desegregation: Sources, Materials and Contacts; V, A Review of the Empirical Research on Desegregation: Community Response, Race Relations, Academic Achievement and Resegregation; VI, Qualitative Literature and Expert Opinion on School Desegregation; VII, Desegregation Strategies and the Courts; VIII, State Strategies for Reducing Racial Isolation; IX, School Desegregation Strategies: A Comprehensive Bibliography.

Two of the researchers involved in the nine-volume Assessment study have also provided three other recent, useful studies in the area of effective desegregation. Hawley has edited Effective School Desegregation: Studies by the National Review Panel on School Desegregation Research (1981), which provides evidence on whether desegregation has been effective overall. Hawley (1981) has also analyzed and synthesized other desegregation studies in Increasing the Effectiveness of School Desegregation: Lessons from the Research. Making Desegregation Work: How Schools Create Social Climates, by Crain, Mahard, and Narot (1982) is a report on their systematic study of 200 desegregated high schools where they tested students and asked questions of more than 10,000 students and 2,000 teachers and principals. Schools were identified as superior in one

way or another, and the study sought to identify reasons for their success. Many of their findings relate directly to the need for, and development of, educational components in desegregated schools.

3. Statement of the Problem

There is a need for an examination of court-ordered educational components related to school desegregation. The need for reports on findings from such an examination is likely to become more acute for state and local educational agencies. The prospect in the 1980s is for fewer guidelines and less support for desegregation from the federal executive and legislative branches, while state and local agencies will nevertheless be required to meet desegregation and equal education mandates from the federal judiciary. It is apparent also that judges and litigants need clearer information and guidelines for designing, implementing, and monitoring desegregation plans, especially those with educational programs and policies.

The hypothesis on which this study is based is that:

> Court-ordered desegregation plans in the SEDL region do not specify educational components (e.g., multi-cultural education and inservice education) in sufficient detail for use by desegregating and/or desegregated schools and districts. And conversely, school district plans do not contain sufficient detail about educational components for the courts to decide whether the district is in compliance.

4. Goal and Objectives

The goal of this project is:

> To produce a set of findings and recommendations with regard to the inclusion of educational programs and inservice educa- in court-ordered school desegregation plans. This will be done by examining court-mandated plans in the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory region to determine the extent to which they include or omit instructions for educational programs and inservice education and by comparing these with the Ways to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools

Process Model and Guidelines for Inservice Education, Multicultural Education, and Desegregation. These findings and recommendations will be for consideration by and use of legal, judicial, and educational personnel and others interested and/or involved in litigating, planning, implementing, or monitoring school desegregation.

The Objectives of this project have been:

1. To formulate criteria for selecting court-ordered desegregation plans for examination.

2. To collect 12-18 (2-3 from each of the six states) court-ordered desegregation plans within the (SEDL) region for examination of their educational components.

3. To conceptualize and design an instrument(s) with which to examine the other court-ordered educational components, in addition to inservice.

4. To obtain additional information from attorneys for each plaintiff and defense involved in the cases related to selected plans.

5. To observe implementation of inservice education (IE) in selected nearby local education agencies LEAs.

6. To compare the court-ordered IE components with the WIEDS IE Model and Guidelines.

7. To assess the information obtained by comparison.

8. To produce a set of findings and recommendations on the basis of the examination of the court-ordered plans and information from attorneys.

9. To submit these findings and recommendations for publication in education and law journals, and use other appropriate and feasible avenues, such as presentations at educational conferences and direct mailouts to key persons, i.e., judges, lawyers, etc., to disseminate the findings and recommendations.

5. Limitations

There are four limitations inherent in this study. Three of these relate to the restriction of the Project primarily to an analysis of the court orders and mandated desegregation plans. These three are: (1) differences in degree of precision of language used in the various orders and plans; (2) the inability to determine whether an educational component

might have been infrequently mandated because (a) its use was considered poor strategy, (b) the court felt constrained to observe certain conditions, or (c) other factors; and (3) the inability to determine, in all cases, whether mandated components are being or have been actually implemented and if so, how effectively.

These would be major restrictions if the goal of this project involved a determination of the extent to which educational components in desegregation court orders and plans were implemented by the districts. Given the goal and objectives of this project, however, i.e., to examine desegregation court orders and plans for the presence or absence of educational components, these are not serious limitations. Further, the study used additional research procedures beyond documentary analysis of court orders and plans. These were: (1) interviews with plaintiff and defense attorneys and other witnesses involved in the cases, and (2) site visits to schools ordered to implement the plans. Information from these procedures helped to (1) clarify language used in the components and (2) determine why more educational components were not included, as well as (3) gain some insight into implementation of mandated educational components.

A fourth limitation relates to the small number of cases (n=15). However, perusal of other desegregation cases from in and outside the six-state region, as well as the review of the literature, indicate that the 15 cases in the study were not atypical. Because sample size precluded rigorous quantitative analysis techniques, a strategy of qualitative analysis was used. (Analysis techniques are discussed in Section C). The methodologies did (1) fit the research questions, (2) test the study's hypothesis, and (3) provide useful information which might help improve

desegregation plans, particularly educational components in plans, whether mandated by courts or initiated by the LEA or other agency.

6. Research Questions

   a. What has research said about the usefulness of educational components in desegregation plans?

   b. To what extent have court-ordered desegregation plans incorporated educational components? What are these components?

   c. Does the court order specify local student needs and community conditions as a basis for the plan's remedies? What are these needs? Are the remedies based on these needs?

   d. What are the commonalities and/or differences of educational components in court-ordered desegregation plans with respect to bi-racial settings? Tri-ethnic settings? Multi-racial settings?

   e. What is the relationship between different school settings (e.g., bi-racial, tri-ethnic, and multi-racial) and the IE content of court-ordered plans?

   f. How does each court-ordered plan for multi-cultural education compare with the WIEDS Guidelines for Multi-cultural Education?

   g. How does each court-ordered plan for desegregation compare with the WIEDS Guidelines for Desegregation?

   h. How does each court-ordered plan for IE compare with the WIEDS Guidelines for IE?

   i. What are the limitations of court-ordered desegregation components?

7. Definitions

One of the findings of the WIEDS study is that there is no universal agreement on definitions of terms relating to desegregation and integration. The following terms are defined as they are used in this report.

Desegregation - the ending of segregation, the bringing together of previously segregated groups.

Integration - the situation wherein people of different groups tend to interact cooperatively on a basis of equal status and trust as they know, understand, and respect each other's culture and contributions.

Race - a more or less distinct human population group distinguished by genetically transmitted physical characteristics.

Culture - the totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns, including: language, social customs (e.g., family organization), ethics and values (including religion), diet, and costume/dress.

Bilingual Education (also referred to in some contexts as "bilingual-bicultural education") - according to the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, a program to incorporate the use of two languages, one of which is English, as media of instruction for children who have limited English-speaking ability. A bilingual education program may encompass all or part of the curriculum and includes the study of the history and culture associated with the student's mother tongue. A complete program develops and maintains the child's self-esteem and pride in both cultures. In a broader sense, bilingual education is a medium of instruction which uses the cultural and linguistic characteristic of non-English speakers as a means for teaching and learning as well as to develop literacy skills in English.

Multi-cultural Education - multi-culturalism, or cultural pluralism, is a view of the larger society being made up of a number of cultures which are different but none is superior to any other and each is equally respected. Multi-cultural education includes instruction and curricula which foster a world view of cultural pluralism. Multi-cultural instruction takes into account the individual's culture as well as other aspects of his/her background which are relevant to the student's dignity,

needs, and learning styles. Multi-cultural curriculum is relevant to local as well as national cultures, and meets the individual's need to know of his/her own culture as well as those of others.

B. METHODOLOGY

1. Description of Documents

The purpose of this project is to produce a set of findings and recommendations regarding the inclusion of educational programs and inservice education in desegregated schools in the SEDL region. In order to do this, 15 court-ordered desegregation plans were collected, identified, and obtained. This number allowed a selection of plans from each of the six states. According to criteria previously determined by Project staff, the court-ordered desegregation plans for examination were to reflect certain demographic and geographic characteristics of the SEDL region. These characteristics include the following:

a. Qualitative

(1) Willingness to participate in the research effort

(2) Extant federal court orders and desegregation plans for examination

(3) As detailed and specific educational components as possible

b. Demographic and Geographic

(1) Mixtures in terms of:

(a) Urban/rural/suburban

(b) Pupil-population (average daily attendance)

Over 40,000
20,001 - 40,000
10,001 - 20,000
Under 10,000

(c) Ethnic composition

1) 20-70% minority student population

2) bi-racial and tri-ethnic

a) Hispanic-Anglo
b) Black-White

c) Native American-Black-White
d) Hispanic-Black-White

(2) Two to three sites in each state of SEDL region (Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas)

(3) Proximity to Austin so site visits would be feasible, considering travel-budget restrictions

Several methods were used to identify potential sites. Project staff searched a variety of sources for local education agencies (LEAs) to meet these criteria. Dockets of federal courts provided names of LEAs in desegregation litigation. Two sources of information were provided by outcomes from earlier phases of the Project: (1) survey findings and (2) files of LEAs considered as interview sites. Project files of newspaper and journal articles about desegregated/desegregating schools were a third source. A fourth source of information was data from telephone and mail queries of SEDL Regional Exchange advisory board members in the six state educational agencies (SEAs) of the region. The survey information was especially helpful in providing demographic data as well as showing whether the districts desegregated under court order. After an initial screening, Project staff contacted superintendents of 23 LEAs to confirm whether they met WIEDS criteria and would cooperate in the study.

Sets of desegregation court orders and plans were collected from 15 LEAs. Partial sets were received from two other LEAs. Difficulty was encountered in obtaining two sets of desegregation documents from LEAs in New Mexico. Project staff, already aware of one New Mexico site which was desegregating under federal court order, requested assistance from state and federal agencies in locating other possible sites. These agencies identified seven additional New Mexico LEAs which had desegregated under federal court order. The regional branch of the federal Office for Civil

Rights sent court orders for four of these. The three other LEAs were contacted directly by Project staff. Staff members soon learned that these three had desegregated voluntarily, and central office administrators in these districts reported that they knew of no other LEAs which had desegregated under court order (CO).

A follow-up phone call to the Regional Office for Civil Rights brought assurances that the desired documentation for four court-desegregated LEAs would be sent. When the documents arrived, Project staff discovered that the school districts involved had not been ordered to desegregate. Three involved orders for bilingual education only (e.g., Serna v. Portales), and one (Natonabah, et al. v. Gallup) was a consent decree which concerned discrimination against Native American students in the use of school facilities but ordered no desegregation. It became apparent that most of the desegregated schools in New Mexico, having a majority of minority students, had desegregated voluntarily. By this time, Project staff had begun examining the documents from the 15 districts already cooperating, including one from New Mexico.

Table 1, below, indicates demographic data of the 15 districts selected. Additional data were collected in order to identify recent short term trends in ethnicity and numbers of students at each site, 1977-1981. These data are shown below, on Table 2.

In all but one of the districts (#12, a bi-ethnic Black-White district) the trend was toward an increased proportion of minority students. These increases ranged from one to six per cent. The largest minority increase was in district #2, also a bi-ethnic Black-Anglo district, which already had the largest percentage of minority students.

TABLE 1

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF FIFTEEN LEA SITES
FOR ANALYSIS OF DESEGREGATION COURT ORDERS AND PLANS

LEA Sites in States in SEDL Region		Pupil Population	
Arkansas	= 2	Over 50,000	= 2
Louisiana	= 3	40,001 - 50,000	= 2
Mississippi	= 2	25,001 - 40,000	= 2
New Mexico	= 1	15,001 - 25,000	= 1
Oklahoma	= 3	10,001 - 15,000	= 2
Texas	= 4	5,001 - 10,000	= 5
		Fewer than 5,000	= 1

LEA Sites in Urban/Rural/Suburban*		LEA Combined Racial/ Ethnic Composition	
Urban	= 13	Minority Percentage:	
Suburban	= 2	20 - 30 %	= 4
Rural	= 4	31 - 40 %	= 6
		41 - 50 %	= 5

* Three LEAs have both urban and suburban populations, and one LEA has urban, suburban, and rural within its boundaries.

TABLE 2

SCHOOL POPULATION ETHNICITY CHANGES
School Years 1977-78 and 1980-81

SCHOOL DISTRICT	ETHNICITY	77-78	%	80-81	%
1	Black	4,430	52%	4,360	54%
	White	4,126	48%	3,655	46%
	Total	8,556		8,015	
2	Black	20,595	65%	22,068	71%
	White	11,081	35%	8,950	29%
	Total	31,676		31,018	
3	Black	14,820	34%	14,473	35%
	White	29,347	66%	22,714	55%
	Hispanic	-	-	1,529	4%
	Nat. Am.	-	-	1,606	4%
	Total	44,167		40,322	
4	Black	690	20%	687	20%
	White	2,643	72%	2,379	68%
	Hispanic	25	1%	57	1%
	Nat. Am.	333	9%	373	11%
	Total	3,691		3,496	
5	Black	2,268	15%	2,270	16%
	White	11,532	75%	10,243	71%
	Hispanic	1,450	9%	1,582	11%
	Nat. Am.	-	-	44	- *
	Other (Asian Am.)	218	1	292	1%
	Total	15,468		14,431	
6	Black	4,080	13%	3,930	13%
	White	19,186	59%	15,937	54%
	Hispanic	8,811	27%	9,149	31%
	Nat. Am.	6	-	-	-
	Other (Asian)	203	-	260	-
	Total	32,286		29,276	
7	Black	9,874	17%	10,301	19%
	White	34,401	58%	29,218	53%
	Hispanic	14,179	24%	15,083	27%
	Nat. Am.	56	-	94	-
	Other (Asian)	481	-	44	-
	Total	58,991		54,740	
8	Black	1,603	20%	1,652	21%
	White	5,346	67%	5,128	65%
	Hispanic	1,027	13%	1,097	14%
	Nat. Am.	-	-	-	-
	Other	20	-	47	-
	Total	7,996		7,924	

*Relatively small numbers, less than 1%, of other groups are not shown; consequently, figures may not add to 100%

TABLE 2 (cont'd)

SCHOOL DISTRICT	ETHNICITY	77-78	%	80-81	%
9	Black	12,716	60%	13,047	63%
	White	8,620	40%	7,320	36%
	Hispanic	-	-	16	-
	Nat. Am.	-	-	7	-
	Other	115	-	190	1%
	Total	21,451		20,580	
10	Black	4,332	54%	4,313	56%
	White	3,745	46%	3,351	44%
	Hispanic	-	-	3	-
	Nat. Am.	-	-	1	-
	Other	-	-	21	-
		8,077		7,689	
11	Black	25,445	53%	25,086	55%
	White	22,827	47%	20,088	44%
	Hispanic	-	-	92	-
	Nat. Am.	-	-	12	-
	Other	-	-	156	-
	Total	48,272		45,434	
12	Black	2,995	35%	2,932	35%
	White	5,473	63%	5,241	63%
	Hispanic	197	2%	73	1%
	Nat. Am.	-	-	6	-
	Other	-	-	11	-
	Total	8,665		8,263	
13	Black	25,840	38%	25,506	40%
	White	42,160	62%	38,886	60%
	Hispanic	-	-	-	-
	Nat. Am.	-	-	-	-
	Other	-	-	-	-
	Total	68,000		64,392	
14	Black	41	-	62	-
	White	3,760	32%	3,888	34%
	Hispanic	7,733	67%	7,174	63%
	Nat. Am.	147	1%	186	2%
	Other	18	-	36	-
	Total	11,599		11,346	
15	Black	1,695	20%	1,682	23%
	White	5,145	62%	5,186	71%
	Hispanic	36	-	52	-
	Nat. Am.	1,494	18%	364	4%
	Other	29	-	32	-
	Total	8,279		7,316	

2. Description of Instruments

A detailed Checklist was developed for the examination of the data. Major headings of the Checklist were made up of educational components identified in the literature and earlier phases of the WISE Project as important to effective desegregation. These components are similar to those prescribed in Milliken v. Bradley "as educational components designed both to equalize the delivery of educational services at all schools and to restore quality education, which has deteriorated due to past acts of discrimination."

(1) Inservice education (IE),

(2) Curriculum - such as remedial, compensatory, bilingual, alternative, etc.,

(3) Discipline,

(4) Extracurricular - such as band, drama, speech, clubs, sports, etc.,

(5) Counseling and career guidance,

(6) Multi-cultural education,

(7) Magnet schools,

(8) Quality of education,

(9) Local needs/conditions,

(10) Parent involvement or community relations.

(11) Student reassignment,

(12) Staff reassignment.

After Project staff developed a draft Checklist, it was pilot-tested. Each staff member used the Checklist to examine the same court order and plan. Results were compared and revisions were made in the Checklist and examination procedures as necessary to provide interrater reliability. The revised Checklist was used for analyzing the content of court orders and

plans for which results are reported and conclusions drawn. This Checklist is found in Appendix A.

3. Procedures

Each court order was examined as a mandate to establish a unitary school district. Each plan was examined as a document which showed how the district was to carry out the mandate. Both documents thus should set some standards and/or give some guidance to persons charged with the responsibility of carrying out the order or implementing the plan. Project staff examined each set of desegregation court orders and plans, making appropriate entries on the Checklist. The Checklist helped to plot the presence, absence, and frequency of occurrence for each item on the list. Each court order and plan was examined independently by staff members. Discrepancies regarding interpretations were resolved through a group examination of and conference about the court order or plan in question.

Data were recorded and tabulated with the use of a specially devised item frequency matrix, subdivided by headings similar to the educational component Checklist. Techniques for each educational component were listed and coded as items on this data tabulation Checklist. Table 3 presents the range of techniques found in the plans and orders. The Checklist was subdivided into the three grade levels (elementary, junior high/middle, and secondary schools).

The completed Checklists for the 15 sites then were tabulated relative to presence, absence and frequency of occurence of each technique used at the elementary, junior high/middle school/and high school levels, or across all levels. This is shown in four tables, 4A-4D, in Appendix B.

TABLE 3

LIST OF DESEGREGATION TECHNIQUES (BY COMPONENT)
USED BY AT LEAST ONE OF FIFTEEN DISTRICTS

C-1 Student Reassignment

(01) Change attendance zones
(02) Pairing and/or clustering
(03) Reassignment
(04) Majority to minority transfer
(05) Closing school
(06) Magnet
(07) Free choice
(08) Construction of school
(09) Busing
(10) Educational Park
(11) Grade centers
(12) Alternative school

C-2 Faculty Reassignment

(01) Ratio assignment (as with "Singleton")
(02) Affirmative action and recruitment of minorities
(03) Reorganization of administrative structure
(04) Random reassignment
(05) Seniority as basic criterion

C-3 Multi-cultural Education

(01) Artists from community as resources
(02) Bilingual-bicultural
(03) Every elementary teacher develops social studies course on human relations
(04) Every secondary teacher participates in preparation of bibliographies and instructional materials on Blacks

C-4 Curriculum (remedial, compensatory, vocational, bilingual (alternative, etc.)

(01) Gifted and talented
(02) Families (groups) of cross-grade learners
(03) Oral language as basis for reading
(04) University and (1) elementary school collaborate
(05) Team-teaching
(06) Individualized and small group approaches
(07) Innovative materials
(08) Achievement grouping (not tracking)
(09) Arts in education program
(10) Minimal use of conventional, routine methodology
(11) Physical rather than sedentary learning
(12) Enlarging oral vocabulary

TABLE 3 (cont'd)

C-4 Curriculum (cont'd)

(13) Computer and electronic technology courses
(14) Cooperative education (including industrial, health, home economics)
(15) New courses in jazz, rock and classical piano, and commercial art
(16) Honors program in English, algebra, geometry, biology, and chemistry
(17) Peer remedial
(18) English as second language
(19) Resource room
(20) Alternative high school
(21) Remedial program
(22) Magnet courses to attract majority students
(23) Needs assessment for remedial course
(24) Title I
(25) Special program learning centers

C-5 Magnet School

(01) Career development center for all students
(02) Academic and performing arts program
(03) Computer science center and medical technology
(04) Enriched daily schedule (recreation and P.E., parent involvement, accelerated programs in math, science, expository writing, and tutoring)
(05) (Court authorizes) school board to establish special focus magnet schools
(06) Magnet school concept used to improve quality of education
(07) Career development center for vocational education
(08) Individualized instruction

C-6 Quality of Education

(01) Viable educational program will "greatly improve the quality of education"
(02) Close schools "too small to be effective" to contribute to the quality of education, and to desegregation
(03) Lowered pupil-teacher ratio in desegregated classes
(04) Quality of education is improved when the "arts are related to each other and to other disciplines," and when "arts are used to create learning situations which help reduce personal and racial isolation and increase self-esteem"
(05) Because of busing stipulated by circuit court, district submitted plan that it "did not deem educationally sound or financially feasible;" and though district and its attorneys "commit to cooperate...in promoting...educational program for the maximum educational advantage of all students in the district"

TABLE 3 (cont'd)

C-6 Quality of Education (cont'd)

(06) Magnet school concept to improve quality of education
(07) Arts in education to improve quality of education
(08) Remedy "must be imposed with a view toward maximum enhancement..."
(09) Reorganization of the district "to provide a quality education for every student"
(10) "Maintain an improved quality of education and level of consideration for all pupils"
(11) Use of assistance of state and the district in achieving "present levels of quality"

C-7 Extracurricular (bands, drama, speech, clubs, sports, etc.)

(01) Special efforts in specialized areas...head coaches, band and choral directors, etc."
(02) Recreational activities
(03) All extracurricular activities and facilities to be used on nondiscriminatory bases
(04) No racial barrier to any student in participating in any extracurricular activity

C-8 Counseling

(01) Counsel minority students "with potential for higher achievement" to take higher math and science courses
(02) "To serve special needs and problems of Negro students"
(03) "Guidance departments will begin to jointly plan revisions in the total guidance program"
(04) Counseling of pupils and educational planning must be considered in regard to courses taken, grade level, and test scores"
(05) Counseling minorities into high math and science courses

C-9 Discipline

(01) Maintain order and discipline in all schools
(02) Every student will have due process before suspension
(03) Minority students not to be disproportionately subject to disciplinary measures
(04) Suspension policies to confirm with Goss v. Lopez
(05) Equal and uniform throughout the district

C-10 Local Needs/Conditions

(01) "There is community apprehension...."
(02) Plan formulated by taking into consideration the "rights, needs and desires of all segments of the community"

TABLE 3 (cont'd)

C-10 Local Needs/Conditions (cont'd)

(03) Tri-ethnic committee
(04) Bi-racial committee

C-11 Parent Involvement or Community Relations

(01) Tri-ethnic committee
(02) Bi-racial committee
(03) Court feels "there is substantial community support for school system; no violence or boycotts"
(04) "If the parties to this law suit and the people of will take a positive and constructive attitude toward this necessary process of desegregation, it can be...."
(05) School will have a director of public relations responsible for informing community of the plan and the progress....
(06) Parents may be offered an orientation at their children's schools where they may meet staff
(07) Public meetings to review zoning and hear protests or comments
(08) Committee to discuss general framework....
(09) CO includes sections of U.S. code on obstruction of justice and violation of rights in enrolling in public schools or college
(10) "Concerns of citizenry" (noted by judge) about safety of children
(11) Child study groups including parents
(12) Teacher-parent conferences
(13) School-home visits
(14) Family homework policy
(15) Director of public relations or home relations to inform community
(16) Provision for adaptions to changes in population (numbers, mobility)

C-12 Inservice

(01) Human relations
(02) Training in cultural awareness, stereotyping, race relations
(03) Training for evaluation and use of multiethnic materials
(04) Social studies
(05) Orientation for desegregation
(06) Training to implement desegregation

Additional information about educational components was obtained from attorneys involved in school desegregation litigation. Project staff were unable to locate attorneys involved in the earlier desegregation suits. Two defense attorneys had retired. All plaintiff lawyers from the U. S. Department of Justice evidently had all changed places of employment and therefore were not accessible. One attorney for minority plaintiffs stated strongly that he would not "participate" in this study without being paid his usual attorney's fee. Some attorneys indicated that (1) their busy schedules left no time to discuss desegregation anytime soon, or (2) the prospect of a case being reactivated prevented their discussing it.

Four attorneys, two for defense and two for plaintiffs but not in the same cases, were helpful and took time to answer questions and discuss desegregation-related issues. One plaintiff attorney not only took time to be interviewed by telephone, but met with Project staff when she was in Austin. She had had prior contact with the Project and had reviewed the WIEDS Model and Guidelines. She stated that judges in recent desegregation cases were receptive to suggestions about specific educational components to improve the desegregation process, and that this might apply especially to Spanish-English bilingual programs. She anticipated, however, that the degree of implementation would vary from district to district and school to school. Another attorney reported that the "Black English Case" (Martin Luther King Junior Elementary School Children v. Ann Arbor School District Board, 1979) was affecting some schools in the SEDL region insofar as they were providing teacher IE regarding an appreciation of Black English. It was feared that if they did not, Black parents might bring suit against the school district.

Project staff also observed IE activities in two nearby LEAs. Attendant to this observation, staff informally interviewed teachers' participating in the workshops. They were asked about the quality and quantity of the training, its value to them in the desegregation process, and who were involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the IE. In these two districts, central office personnel with responsibilities for desegregation-related IE and educational programs were interviewed, some by phone and others in person.

C. RESULTS

1. Description of Techniques Used

In order to test this study's hypothesis that court-ordered desegregation plans in the SEDL region do not specify educational components in sufficient detail for their use by desegregated/desegregating schools and districts, two qualitative research techniques were used: (1) descriptive and (2) comparative.

Each court order and district plan underwent a thorough descriptive content analysis. Where possible, the link from court order to district plan has been shown. In the fewer cases where possible (three), the link is shown between CO to plan to inservice to implement the component. Each time a technique of an educational component was found in an order or plan, an entry describing that technique was recorded in the appropriate cell of the Checklist. This linked the technique with one and sometimes two educational components (because the magnet school technique was classified as a components, it fit with three components - magnet, quality education, and student reassignment). Each entry of a technique on the Checklist also identified whether it was in an order or plan and at what grade level(s) the technique was to be used (elementary, junior high/middle school, high school, or all three).

All sets of documents were examined and described in this manner by three staff members. Three Checklists were completed for each of the 15 districts in the study. In staff conferences, each set of three Checklists were compared and discussed. One master Checklist was produced by consolidating the findings from the three Checklists. Demographic data with regard to the district also was entered on the Checklist.

The completed Checklists and master Checklist facilitated the examination of court order and desegregation plan components with regard to possible relationships to student race. Finally, each district's Checklist of educational components and techniques was compared to the Ways to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools (WIEDS, an earlier phase of Project WISE) Guidelines for Desegregation, Multi-cultural Education, and IE.

2. Discussion of the Findings

The following discussion of findings with regard to educational components in desegregation court orders and district plans is organized according to the 12 components (Table 3, Page 27). "Quality of education" is discussed prior to some other components because of its overarching nature and the way it was treated in the orders and plans as well as in the literature. Although perhaps not directly related to educational policy and practices, the student and faculty assignment components are included in this study for two reasons: (a) particular techniques of these components can affect desegregation outcomes, including educational benefits, and (b) the Project wanted to examine the possibility of relationships between these techniques and other components examined.

For each component discussed there will be (1) a definition and/or description of that component, (2) a brief discussion of what research has said about the usefulness of that component and whether it is recommended by research findings for inclusion in the preparation for desegregation, and (3) the extent to which that component is included in the court orders and plans examined in this study.

a. Student Reassignment

Desegregation, because it includes putting an end to segregation and racial isolation, includes some technique of reassigning students. (After the plan is in operation, then it may more appropriately be termed "assignment" rather than "reassignment.") There are, of course, degrees of desegregation; differing amounts are acceptable to the courts depending upon circumstances. The general constitutional standard, established by the U. S. Supreme Court is "the maximum amount of actual desegregation in light of the practicalities of the local situation" (Green v. New Kent County, 1968; also Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg, 1971). Other than in the establishment of a violation, most of the testimony in desegregation cases concerns student reassignment, how many of whom go where and how.

Research literature considers more than the constitutional issues of equal opportunity and burden (the extent of "two-way" busing, etc.). But because techniques do apparently have impact on educational outcomes, there has been considerable research, and even more argument, with regard to "mixing" techniques. For example, the Hawley et al. (April 1981) synthesis of findings on Strategies for Effective Desegregation contains almost the same amount of discussion on the physical aspects of desegregation outside the school (student assignment and neighborhoods) as to structural, organizational, and curriculum concerns - 55 pages to 56 pages respectively. This is probably representative of recent research, and it is not to say that there has been too much research with regard to the physical considerations of desegregation. Probably more research is needed with regard to organizational, curricular, and instructional concerns.

Some popular conceptions of racial issues in desegregation need to be questioned, for example, Crain et al. examined a common school desegre-

gation controversy, wherein Whites have argued that desegregation is acceptable but busing is not - apparently meaning that Whites should be left in their own schools, which should be desegregated by bringing in a small number of Blacks, preferably middle class Blacks. This message has been relayed so many times that many people assumed it had some basis in fact, that the best desegregated schools were indeed predominantly White schools in White neighborhoods where middle class Blacks were bused in. Related to this is the common belief that large numbers of Black students in a school hold back instruction, thus slowing the academic growth of White students there. But in looking at their data, Crain et al. (1982) found that White students in predominantly Black schools had higher achievement than similar White students in predominantly White schools. In fact, in examining varieties of racial mixes, Crain et al. found that there is no such thing as an ideal racial composition.

The use of computers and meta-analysis methods have made it possible to glean data from numerous doctoral dissertations based on empirical research in desegregated schools. These findings indicate that desegregation enhances minority achievement and does not diminish that of majority students (Rossell et al., April 1981). Other recent findings indicate that for enhancement of achievement test scores, development of positive race relations, and prevention of resegregation ("White flight"), desegregation should: begin in the earliest grade possible, including kindergarten (Coleman, 1966; Katz, 1976; Hawley et al., April 1981; Rossell et al., April 1981, Crain et al., 1982), and not be voluntary (Rossell 1978; Rossell et al., April 1981).

Student assignment plans should not be voluntary, but mandatory, whether ordered by the school district or a court. Findings indicate a negative relationship between whether a plan is voluntary and the reduction of racial isolation (see also Magnet Schools, below). Although voluntary plans tend to result in less White flight, the volunteers are mostly Black secondary students; few Hispanics, Anglos, and elementary pupils participate. It seems likely that more Hispanics would tend to participate voluntarily in programs which provided sound bilingual education programs in the receiving schools (Cardenas, June 1977; Rossell et al., April 1981).

In many school districts, putting an end to racial isolation requires transporting some students of one or more racial groups. Busing may be defined for desegregation purposes as not attending the school nearest one's home (Crain et al., 1982). Busing of both minority and majority students in a district is two-way busing. In one-way busing, it is usually a minority group which is transported. Hawley et al. (April 1981) found no empirical evidence that one-way busing is "harmful." It is probably no more harmful to the group bused than it is to those involved in two-way busing. Crain et al. (1982), found that in any busing, those bused may have a sense of not belonging in the school, may suffer loss of self-esteem, and the quality of racial contact may be harmed unless steps are taken to counteract these results.

When they are bused, even in one-way plans, Blacks do not resort to protests and flight as Whites often do (Hawley et al., April 1981). No evidence is available on other minority groups. One-way busing of any group does, however, raise equity issues. Most desegregation experts

interviewed by Broh and Trent in 1981 generally advocated two-way busing because of equity questions and longer-term minority community support for desegregation. In a study of desegregated schools in southwestern states, King in 1981 found no long-term problems resulting from either one-way or two-way busing.

Examination of the court orders and plans pertaining to desegregation of the 15 selected schools in Project WISE discloses the use of 13 different student reassignment techniques (Table 3, page 27). Most of these techniques were used by one or two of the three grade levels (Tables 4-A, 4-B, 4-C, Appendix B), and ten were used in plans specifying their use at all levels (Table 4-D, Appendix B). Other than busing, which is used for desegregation in conjunction with other reassignment techniques, the most popular of the 13 techniques for student mixing were changing attendance zones, pairing and/or clustering, and some form of random reassignment (Table 4A-D). These techniques were used across all grade levels (1-12) in four plans, but were most widely used at the elementary school level with nine districts indicating this as a technique employed. The next most commonly used assignment plan was that of grade centers (e.g., designating a previously Black elementary school (1-6) to a school attended only by sixth grade minority and majority pupils). Kindergartens were not included in any of the plans. First grades were included in two, one with change of attendance zones and one with pairing.

Busing was used in conjunction with several techniques. Interestingly, it was not used in any district plan for high schools alone (Table 4-C) but was used in one district at the elementary level only (Table 4-A) and in another at the junior high level only (Table 4-B).

Busing was used in seven districts across all three levels (Table 4-D). One district avoided the use of busing for desegregation by ending all public school transportation. Although not specified in its plan, one of the two voluntary desegregation districts in this study also has bused a significant number of its students for desegregation.

The voluntary desegregation plan along with four other plans specified majority to minority transfers. This allowed individual students to change schools in cases where it would enhance desegregation at both schools. In each instance, this technique was used in conjunction with others. Magnet programs (which, because of its frequent association with quality of education, will be discussed separately below), new school construction, an educational park, and the counseling of minority students into advanced math and science courses also were used concomitantly with placement techniques (Tables 4A-D).

Other than in the study's one district which desegregated voluntarily, most of the student-assignment techniques used in district plans were specified in the court orders (Tables 4A-D). This was true also with regard to faculty reassignment.

b. Faculty Reassignment

"Faculty reassignment" is used in this study to describe desegregation of school and district staff. The literature and some court orders recognize three categories of school personnel. These three personnel categories are: (1) administrative, (2) certificated, and (3) noncertificated.

Research in staff desegregation includes some quantitative studies and some qualitative studies; some of the findings in both types of studies are

speculative. Some findings do seem clear and well founded. In a school with a desegregated student body and an all-Anglo teaching staff, there are likely to be (1) more second generation desegregation problems, and (2) more difficulty in obtaining good student achievement and preparing students for adult roles. Further, it seems clear that minority students, as well as majority students, see role models of their same race in positions of authority. It is also clear, however, that many teachers are as effective with other-race students than some teachers are with same-race students. Thus, the available evidence shows that desegregated schools should have desegregated staffs (Hawley et al., April 1981). Quantitative research findings also indicate that the school staffs should have IE to prepare them to teach diverse student populations (NIE, July 1976; St. John, 1975; Hawley et al., April 1981). The benefits of having a trained, desegregated staff include improvements in (1) race relations, (2) minority self-esteem and achievement (Hawley et al., April 1981), and (3) student-faculty communication, as well as providing minority children with significant others of their own race (St. John, 1975). Qualitative literature also supports these findings and adds that desegregating the staff could help improve public response to school desegregation (Broh and Trent, April 1981).

As is common in school desegregation, school districts in this study used fewer techniques (five) for faculty reassignment than for student reassignment (twelve). The school district plans generally specified no faculty desegregation other than that contained in the order (Table 4-D). One district did, however, reorganize its administrative structure at the junior high and high school levels without an order (Tables 4-B and 4-C). The voluntary district specified no plan of faculty desegregation.

The technique used most frequently to reassign faculty is actually a standard set forth originally in the case of Singleton v. Jackson Municipal Separate School District (419 F.2d 1211, 5th Cir. 1970; cert. den. 402 U. S. 944, 1970). The basic Singleton criterion is that the district's minority and majority staff be reassigned so that they are substantially the same ratio in each school as is the ratio of minority to majority staff in the entire district.

The Singleton rule, however, does leave some discretion to districts as to how to achieve the ratio. Even more than with student desegregation, most of the court orders examined by the Project dealt with faculty reassignment by specifying one or another technique across all levels (Table 4-D). This is perhaps because age and transportation considerations bear less weight in faculty assignments than student assignments. Supplementary techniques specified by the court included:

- Affirmative action and recruitment of minorities,
- Reorganization of administrative structure,
- Random assignment,
- Seniority as basic criterion.

c. Quality of Education

The staff of the Division of Family, School and Community Studies, which includes Project WISE, has developed a working definition of quality of education:

> Quality education...is the outcome of effective schools and includes a range of experiences that (1) focus on learner academic achievement, (2) employ a variety of teaching methods (3) promote learning on the part of all students, (4) take into account individual differences, and (5) produce learner competencies in terms of measurable knowledge and skill outcomes.

This definition is compatible with the discussion of quality of education in research literature on effective schooling (Westbrook, 1982) and is useful in this study. The concept of "quality education" or "quality of education" is frequently mentioned and sometimes discussed, without a definition or standard for measurement, in desegregation research literature, cases, orders, and plans.

When quality education is mentioned with regard to desegregation, it is often used in one of two ways: (1) as one of desegregation's two overarching goals, along with educational equity (e.g., Chesler et al., 1981), or (2), by critics of desegregation who say that the two concepts, desegregation and quality education, are antithetical (Clasby, October 1974; Willie, May 1976; Kirp, August 1981). Most desegregation experts believe that quality education is not only desirable and attainable, but should be an essential component of desegregation. Stollee (July 1979), however, has pointed out that the Supreme Court has held that the Fourteenth Amendment does not guarantee high quality of education but only equal access to whatever quality of education a given school system provides. Kirp (August 1981) asserts that when trial judges voice concern for quality education it is sometimes as part of their quest for a desegregation settlement politically acceptable to all parties, but at other times, the judges speak without heed to any party's views (Kirp and Babcock, 1981).

When plaintiffs in desegregation suits demand quality education, the courts tend to say that that is the school board's business, the matter before the court is equality (Stollee, July 1979). Stollee, an education professor and desegregation planner, claims that when desegregation is ordered, the school boards are usually so busy working on plans at the

last minute, and have such short time for quality planning allowed for, that quality education suffers from inattention, and the public cries out that desegregation has ruined the schools. This may be one of the reasons why Bell (1970), a professor of law at Harvard University, and other Blacks have voiced despair over the frustrations of using courts and desegregation as means of obtaining quality education.

Perhaps it is because quality education is an "elusive notion" (Kirp, August 1981), that research findings with regard to it and desegregation are not more specific. Much of the literature, however, does seem to be aimed at helping the policy makers and practitioners in their efforts to upgrade education. Forehand and Ragosta premised their research and their Handbook for Integrated Schooling (July 1976) on the assumptions: (1) that schooling will and should be integrated and (2) there are positive actions that can be taken to maximize the educational benefits of integrated schooling. Their Handbook is to help practitioners bring about the conditions with maximum benefits, to help schools "be more successful," and "successful" means having "positive benefits for children - benefits to their learning, their attitudes, and their effectiveness as individuals and citizens" (Ragosta and Forehand, July 1976).

Other researchers have prefaced their reports similarly. St. John (1975) pointed out the need to maximize school conditions which maximize benefits for children. Some, more quantitative researchers, define improvements in educational quality as shown on scores on standardized tests of verbal and quantitative skills (Hawley et al., April 1978). Forehand and Ragosta and St. John are among those who use academic achievement and affective factors in measuring quality education and

include their findings with regard to educational components which are generally catagorized more or less as they are in this project.

The concept of quality education was used in two of the court orders examined (Table 4-D). In one, because of court-ordered busing, the defendant district was being quoted as having to submit a plan the school board "did not deem educationally sound" but did "commit to cooperate...in promoting...(an) educational program for the maximum educational advantage of all students in the district." In another court order, the judge stated that the remedy that the school board was to devise in its plan "must be imposed with a view toward maximum enhancement of educational quality." The board responded with a plan which used the term three times, a frequency equalled by only one other district.

Nine times, in four of the fifteen district plans, the term or concept of quality education appeared (Tables 4-C and 4-D). One district plan, subsequently referred to as District I plan, used the concept twice, both times in reference to all levels (Table 4-D):

- maintain an improved quality of education and level of consideration for all pupils
- use of assistance of the state and the district in achieving "present levels of quality"

Only one district plan which used the term, herein referred to as District II plan, used it once (across all levels, Table 4-D). That was:

- a viable educational program will "greatly improve the quality of education."

One of the district plans which used the concept three times, subsequently referred to as District III plan, was in response to the court order which had also used the term. These usages (across all levels, Table 4-D) are:

- a viable education program will "greatly improve the quality of education"

- reorganization of the district "to provide a quality education for every student"
- "maintain an improved quality of education and level of consideration for all pupils"

Two of the preceding usages in the District III plan contain some wording identical to usages in the plans of Districts I and II. Districts II and III are in the same state and were at one time parties in the same suit. Other districts in this study were also parties to that suit, but no similarities with regard to quality education were found in their plans. Attorneys or planners involved in the two plans discussed here may have conferred, or individuals in one of the districts may have read the District I plan (which was the earliest in this study, 1969). The cases for Districts II and III were tried in the same trial court but had different attorneys.

District III's plan contains wording also contained in the District I plan, i.e., "maintain an improved quality of education." These two districts are in different states, and more than a decade of time separates the development of their plans. A principal planner of the District I plan was also used briefly as a consultant in District III and could possibly have been responsible for the common wording. It is probably not uncommon, however, for attorneys and consultants in a desegregation suit to become familiar with plans already accepted by one court or another.

One other district plan, District IV plan, referred three times to quality of education, each usage related across all levels to its magnet program (Table 4-D). These usages are:

- to improve the quality of education with lowered pupil-teacher ratio in desegregated classes;

- Quality of education is improved when the "arts are related to each other and to other disciplines," and when "arts are used to create learning situations which help reduce personal and racial isolation and increase self-esteem."
- Magnet school concept to improve quality of education.

Use of these techniques will be discussed in the section dealing with magnet schools.

References to quality education in the plans and orders were vague. The technique which referred to reduction of the pupil-teacher ratio did not specify the ratio. Other references were even more nebulous. This is not to say that the references to quality education were not sincere or that those orders and plans not referring directly to the concept had no intention of enhancing quality education in their respective districts. Inservice ducation and other educational components discussed in the following paragraphs also bear directly on quality of education.

d. Multi-cultural Education

Multi-cultural education is a more comprehensive concept than multi-ethnic education which is limited to the concerns of racial and ethnic groups. Multi-cultural education is a set of experiences in a setting which promotes educational equity for a wider range of cultural groups in addition to racial and ethnic groups (Banks, 1981).

Considerable research has been conducted with regard to multi-cultural education and its effects. Literature reviewed by the Project supports an assertion that multi-cultural education is crucial to educational equity for all students and should thus be reflected in all of a school's programs and general atmosphere. Katz (1964) concluded from his review of desegregation studies that the several factors that influenced Black students' academic performance included social conditions in the school and

classroom, the degrees of acceptance by significant others (particularly White teachers and peers), and the Black pupil's self-concept in regard to the probability of social and academic success or failure. After her early review of desegregation/integration research, St. John (February 1970) concluded that the most plausible hypothesis was that the relation between desegregation and achievement is conditional, and that the academic performance of minority group children will be higher in integrated than in equivalent segregated schools, provided that they are supported by staff and accepted by peers.

The behavior and attitude of teachers and other school staff should reflect an appreciation of the various cultures represented by the school's diverse student body. Since 1970 there has been a growing pool of empirical research available on the correlation between the behavior and attitudes of teachers and the attitudes and academic performance of pupils, as well as how to improve that performance (e.g., Krantz, 1970; Good and Brophy, 1973; Gay, 1975; Hawley et al., April 1981; Rossell et al., April 1981; Crain, Mahard, and Narot, 1982). The development of sophisticated and reliable data collection tools such as the Flanders System of Interactional Analysis (see in Amidon and Hough, 1967), Brophy and Good's (1969) Teacher-Child Dyadic Interaction System, as well as sociometric scales and bipolar semantic differential scales (see Bonjean, et al., 1967) have been important in assessing teacher attitudes and behavior toward pupils. The results of most investigations using these tools yield rather convincing data that teacher behavior strongly affects pupil behavior and has important implications for minority children (Gay, 1975).

The work of Mendels and Flanders (1973) indicates that "naturalistic" input is powerful in determining teachers' attitudes toward their students. These naturalistic factors include perceived physical attractiveness, socio-economic status, and ethnicity (Gay, 1975). Frequently, more than one of these factors are present to influence teachers' attitudes and behavior toward the more visible minority children, including the Black American, Mexican American, and Native American in the SEDL region.

U. S. social science literature documents the majority view of the culturally different as inferior, culturally, intellectually, and socially (Kane, 1970; and Stent, Hazard, and Rivlin, 1973). Four relevant studies were conducted in the southwestern United States during the early 1970's - the U. S. Civil Rights Commission, Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans (1974), and Barnes (1973), Gay (1974), and Mangold (1974) on Hispanic, Black, and Anglo teachers' verbal and non-verbal interactions with Hispanic, Black, and Anglo pupils. These studies indicate that White students receive more praise, encouragement, and opportunities for substantive interaction with teachers, while teacher contacts with Black and Hispanic students are mostly procedural, negative, and disciplinary. The findings strongly suggest that student ethnicity is one of the major determinants of teachers' attitudes and behavior toward their students; that teachers, including minority teachers, expect less of minority students and give them fewer opportunities and less encouragement and positive feedback; that these conditions are detrimental to the quality of education; and that many minority children are being denied equal opportunity for quality education.

Educational investigators have agreed (1) upon the significance of teacher attitudes and behavior towards pupils, (2) that teacher-student interactions are the heart of the educational process, and (3) that teachers are "significant others" in students' lives (Gage, 1963; Purkey, 1970). Although Washington (1968), Banks (1970), Banks and Grambs (1972), and Gay (1975) argued cogently that teachers are especially important in the lives of ethnic minority students, other investigators and educators belatedly applied these points to desegregation. Even though a great deal of desegregation research occurred in the 1960's and 1970's, relatively little has been done on how to implement the findings in the school and classroom. That a school's program could affect the outcomes of desegregation was supported by findings by Forehand et al. Their Final Report: Conditions and Processes of Effective School Desegregation (1976), indicated that multi-cultural school activities and attitudes tended to improve race relations as well as academic achievement by Black students in the school.

Howsam et al. pointed out the need for training to implement multi-cultural education. In their Educating a Profession (1976), they recognized that most educators were reared in middle- or lower middle-class homes and communities, away from minority and lower socio-economic groups. The seriousness of this situation was recognized and pointed out by the board of directors of teacher preparation institutions themselves, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE, 1976). They observed that most teachers did not have adequate knowledge of the various cultural systems from which their pupils come, and it had been assumed for too long that any "good teacher" could provide for the learning needs of

children from diverse cultural backgrounds. As evidenced in low student achievement rates, said the AACTE, there was an impelling need for reform.

The lack of multi-cultural education for and by educators undoubtedly contributes to what have been called second generation desegregation problems. Arising after the physical desegregation of students and staff, these problems prevent schools from providing effective education for all students. They can be characterized as acts of omission or commission that continue discrimination or effects of past discrimination against minority groups.

Although their impact is destructive, such negative attitudes and behavior receive less attention perhaps because they are not so overt as a stated policy that maintains a segregated school district. Some second generation problems are: (1) reduction of public support for desegregated public schools, as shown especially by resegregation or White flight; (2) segregation of students within "desegregated" schools; (3) retention of segregated or mono-cultural curricula; (4) placement of disproportionate numbers of minority students in special education classes or lowest academic "tracks"; (5) suspension, expulsion, or other punishment of disproportionately high percentages of minority students (King, 1981).

Desegregation literature on education is replete with studies, reports, and monographs indicating the need for effective multi-cultural education. After analyzing 120 studies of school desegregation, St. John (1975) concluded that further investigation of the general question--"Does desegregation benefit children?"--would seem a waste of resources. Rather, the pressing need is to discover the school conditions under which the benefits of mixed schooling are maximized and its hardships minimized. It

is important to note, as did Kirk and Goon (1975), that these conditions--identified in studies reviewed by themselves, St. John, and in others discussed earlier--are not unique to success for minority students in a desegregated setting, but they are vitally important to academic success for anyone in any educational setting.

From these studies it may be concluded that in an integrated, multicultural setting: (1) academic achievement rises for the minority children while relatively advantaged majority children continue to learn at the same or higher rate, (2) minority children may gain a more positive self-concept, and (3) positive racial attitudes by minority and majority students develop as they attend school together (see also Weinberg, 1977a, 1977b; Edmonds, 1979; Bennett, May 1979; Epps, 1979).

None of the court orders examined by the Project was found to include any use of the term or concept of multi-cultural education. Few instances of its use were indicated in the district plans. At the elementary level, one district specified the use of minority as well as majority artists to help teach pupils about different local cultures, but this occurred only in magnet schools. In another district's 1969 plan, it was stated that every secondary teacher would participate in the preparation of bibliographies and instructional materials on Black culture, and every elementary level teacher would develop a social studies "course on human relations." Recent interviews of district faculty, staff, and parents indicated that not only was this implemented, but more multi-cultural education has gradually developed since then (WIEDS Report, November 1979).

One of the districts with a volunteer plan stipulated that a bilingual-bicultural (Spanish-English, Hispanic-Anglo) program would be

implemented. Interviews with school personnel in the other four districts with Hispanic enrollments indicated that each has at least one bilingual-bicultural program in operation there, though not stipulated in their desegregation plans.

The discussion of this study's research question number six includes a comparison of each district plan's multi-cultural elements with the WIEDS Multi-cultural Education Guidelines. This discussion is on pages 73-75.

e. Curriculum

Other than with regard to multi-cultural education most curricular changes brought about by desegregation have been in the nature of compensatory and remedial education. These are programs intended to remove former inequities and to equalize educational opportunities among socio-economic and ethnic groups (St. John, 1975). Beginning in 1964 when Congress passed the Economic Opportunity Act, which established Head Start, Upward Bound, and other programs, numerous federal and state educational programs have been enacted in the interest of increasing the equity of educational benefits for various populations. Judicial action has also caused compensatory services to be provided for poor, low-achieving pupils and for pupils in racially isolated and newly desegregated schools. (For brief discussions of these programs, see Van Camp, 1979; Rossell, et al., April 1981.)

As intended, these compensatory education programs serve primarily minority students, who are disproportionately represented in low-income and low-achieving categories. This minority over-representation and the reliance of many compensatory programs on pulling the students being served out of regular classrooms, result in the segregation of some minority

students within otherwise desegregated schools. Rossell et al. (April 1981) discuss the findings of several researchers who find that it may be difficult to implement desegregation and compensatory education simultaneously. The opportunities for conflict increased after the Milliken v. Bradley decision (1977) encouraged federal courts to avoid costly and unpopular student reassignment plans in favor of compensatory programs (Flygare, December 1977). The compensatory programs have been generally popular with school districts, and many school administrators, especially those in urban districts, say that such programs are essential to attaining quality education (Rossell et al., April 1981; Education Daily, September 16, 1982).

A wide variety of curricular techniques were used in the plans which were examined. Only one technique was used by more than one school--magnet courses to attract minority students--was used in two plans. More curricular desegregation strategies were used at the elementary level than at any other.

Eleven of the 19 elementary curricular desegregation techniques, including most of a compensatory nature, were in one district's plan (Table 4-A). This same district was the only one with a plan specifying curricular techniques at the junior high/middle school level (Table 4-B) and it also accounted for four of the six strategies used at the high school only level (Table 4-C).

Reports (Rossell et al., 1981) of the popularity of compensatory programs are not reflected in the desegregation plans examined by the Project. This is not unusual; most compensatory education funds are awarded to districts after their desegregation plan is accepted (Van Camp, 1979).

Interviews with personnel in the Project school districts indicate that each district has had at least one compensatory program since desegregation, and the districts with Hispanic enrollment have a bilingual program.

f. Magnet Schools

The magnet school concept is used as a student reassignment technique, because such a school has a distinctive program of study that will attract a voluntary cross section of students from all racial groups in the district. Distinctive program themes have featured gifted and/or talented student programs, vocational education, the arts, science and math, basics, foreign language, and humanities, with the latter appearing usually at the secondary level (McMillan, 1980; Levine and Havighurst, 1977; Theory into Practice, February 1978 and April 1978).

There is controversy among desegregation consultants and researchers about the use of magnet schools as a technique for ending racial isolation. Foster (February 1973) has termed it a "spurious technique" because it produces little desegregation and tends to usurp funds and the better staff from other schools. Others as McMillan (1980) and Levine and Havighurst (1977) admit that it has limitations, such as not offering enough program options and producing pressure from non-magnet schools which also want program improvements, but cite advantages such as helping to avoid White flight. There is agreement that White students are less likely to enroll in magnet schools in minority neighborhoods, although the reverse is not the case (Rossell et al., April 1978).

Rossell's (1979) findings indicate that only in districts with less than 30 per cent minority enrollment can magnet schools by themselves bring about much desegregation. Used within a mandatory plan, magnet schools can

have desegregated enrollments in districts with higher percentage minority enrollments and can help prevent White flight (McMillan, 1980). Rossell (1979) finds that in these districts it is the mandatory nature of the plan which produces the desegregation by narrowing the opportunities to escape desegregation. She also has found that there is no evidence to support an argument that the use of a magnet program as part of a mandatory plan lessens community hostility to forced aspects of the plan (Rossell, 1979; April 1981).

Courts have become generally skeptical of magnet-only plans, especially in districts with sizeable minority student enrollment (Hawley et al., April 1981). In the court orders examined by the Project, judges authorized the use of magnets in five instances (Tables 4-A, 4-B, 4-C, and 4-D). One district established a magnet elementary school with a number of instructional and curricular innovations to attract a range of students (Table 4-A; see also discussion of curricular techniques, above). In interviews with Project staff, teachers in that school reported that its magnet program is still operating, successful with students, and popular with parents.

At the junior high/middle school level (Table 4-B), one district established an academic and performing arts program in one school; another district established a program of individualized instruction (Table 4-B). Both programs are reported in interviews to have brought some desegregation to the schools. At the high school only level (Table 4-C), a computer science center and medical technology program is increasing in enrollment but not as rapidly as expected by school officials.

Two districts established magnet programs of sorts across all levels (Table 4-D). In one district a career development center was placed in one building at each level; but only at the high school level was there evidence of much vocational education. At what was once the predominantly Black high school, another district established programs for "enriched daily schedule" (including innovative recreation and physical education classes, parental involvement, accelerated math, science, and writing programs, and individual tutoring). In interviews with Project staff, the principal and teachers at the school indicated that morale of the desegregated staff and student body is reported to be high, absenteeism is low, and student achievement is improving.

g. Extracurricular Activities

"Extracurricular activities" are all school-sponsored activities other than those directly related to curricular and instructional programs. Extracurricular activities include, for example, student body government, band and other music programs, sports other than physical education classes, and math clubs, as well as others.

Since Allport's (1954) findings, it is more and more commonly accepted that improved race relations can be most effectively accomplished through personal contacts between different race students under certain conditions which include equal status and cooperation toward a common goal. Findings indicate that an effective extracurricular program will not only strengthen race relations, but also will improve student morale, which in turn tends to help improve academic achievement (Hawley et al.; see also Forehand and Ragosta, 1976; Crain et al., 1982).

Only one of the court orders examined by the Project spoke to the desegregation of extracurricular activities, specifying that nowhere in the district would there be any racial barrier to any student participation (Table 4-D). No directive for affirmative action was issued. One school plan indicated that "special efforts" would be made to desegregate staff in "specialized areas" such as "head coaches, band and choral directors, etc." (Table 4-D). Another district's plan promised: all extracurricular activities and facilities were to be used on nondiscriminatory bases (Table 4-D).

IE is important for the effective desegregation of extracurricular activities for several reasons. First, there is the general training for cultural awareness and race relations skills which are desirable for all school staff. Specialized training is also needed for staff with responsibilities in extracurricular activities. Such IE should include awareness of the importance of extracurricular activities in school desegregation, and procedures to desegregate and integrate their respective activity. These procedures would involve, for example, recruitment of participants so that all school racial/ethnic groups are represented in each activity.

h. Counseling

Integration of its counseling program has important implications for desegregating a school. The large field of research on the subject indicates that minority students in the school will probably benefit from having counselors of their race. These benefits for minority students include: (1) more of them will complete high school, (2) they will be better informed about available college scholarships and admission

procedures, and (3) they will tend to have successful college experiences (Braddock and McPartland, 1981; Hawley et al., April 1981).

Inservice education is needed for minority and majority counselors. All counselors need to be aware of financial aid and educational opportunities at traditionally Black colleges and at traditionally Anglo colleges (Hawley et al., April 1981). This awareness is only part of the IE necessary for effective cross-cultural counseling. Cherry A. Banks (in J. Banks, 1981) has pointed out that the nature of counseling requires that counselors relate to individuals rather than to stereotypic members of generalized or monolithic groups. Counseling based on stereotypes can easily lead to misunderstandings and anger. Such misuse of the concept of culture generally results from too little information about cultures. Multi-cultural IE for counselors can not only help prevent the negative effects which result from counseling based on stereotypes, it can prepare the counselors to help their clients reduce their cultural prejudices (C. Banks in J. Banks, 1981).

All school staff members should have a general awareness of the nature of prejudice. Counselors have a particular need to be well-informed about the psychology of racism and how to help students and other staff change prejudiced attitudes and behavior (Green, July-August 1975). This would include, for example, an understanding of the three processes commonly used by people to resist changing prejudiced attitudes on which discriminatory behavior is based: avoidance; selective perception and memory; and group support (Allport, 1954). Counselors may also need IE for awareness and skills in multi-cultural testing and assessment practices. The use and misuse of testing and assessment instruments and practices standardized

according to a particular socio-economic and cultural group has serious negative implications for multi-cultural and desegregated education as well as for equal educational opportunity (e.g., Ronald J. Samuda, 1975; Weinberg's discussion of intelligence testing, and "Race and Intelligence in America," March 1977; Jane R. Mercer, 1979; Gould, 1982). As well-informed staff members, counselors can be valuable resources for the IE of other school staff.

Counseling was mentioned in only one of the court orders examined. It directed the district to "serve the special needs and problems of Negro students" (Table 4-D). Nothing was spelled out in that district's plan as to how the mandate would be implemented. Counseling provisions in other plans were also vague. One plan said the district would counsel minority students "with potential for higher achievement" to take higher math and science courses (Table 4-D). In another, the district said that the previously separate Black and White high school guidance departments "will begin to jointly plan revisions" in a new, desegregated guidance program (Table 4-C).

i. Discipline

Especially during the first year of desegregation, and prior to that if possible, care should be taken by the district to see to it that students know what is expected of them and what the rules are. After desegregation, minority students are commonly suspended and expelled in disproportionate numbers. It has been suggested that this may be an attempt by schools to limit the effects of desegregation and help prevent resegregation (Hawley et al., April 1981).

A great deal is known about how to limit student expulsion and suspension (NIE, July 1976; Hawley et al., April 1981). But few of these findings are reflected in the court orders and district plans examined in the Project. One district plan indicated that order and discipline would be maintained in all schools (Table 4-D). Only one district (with a volunteer plan) provided any detail with regard to discipline/punishment procedures, giving four related points:

- Every student will have due process before suspension
- Minority students not to be disproportionately subject to disciplinary measures
- Suspension policies to conform to Goss v. Lopez
- Disciplinary measures to be equal and uniform throughout the district.

It may be presumed that other districts in the Project have similar codes, particularly with regard to Goss v. Lopez; even so, it appears that publication and distribution of such codes is salutary (Hawley et al., April 1981).

j. Local Needs and Conditions

Local needs and conditions which should be considered include primarily social, economic, political, demographic, and geographic issues. Many of these needs and conditions have to do with school-community and school-parent relations, but these should not displace student needs if there is a conflict. Student needs should receive first priority, and community and home relations considerations next. In many instances local needs and considerations will coincide with student needs. These local needs/conditions include:

- Preserve "neighborhood" schools which are desegregated or are moving toward desegregation (Rossell and Ross, 1979).

- In larger districts when possible maintain a neighborhood element by subdividing the district into smaller, racially balanced sub-districts with reassignment only within those sub-districts (Rossell and Hawley, 1981). This approach may reduce options for racial balance so severely in some districts that it is not feasible, but it is an approach which should be considered.

- Changes for individual students and student cohorts should be minimized. This means moving as few students as possible; if they must be moved, move as large a segment of cohorts as possible.

- Keep students of the same family together so far as feasible.

- Bus only as many children as necessary and as far as necessary to achieve desegregation.

- A phasing-in plan should be avoided as it tends to increase White flight, especially in a community with a history of strained race relations and/or opposition to desegregation (Rossell, 1978; Armour, 1980).

- Desegregation plans should promote social class integration as well as racial/ethnic integration (Coleman, 1966; Pettigrew, 1971).

- School authorities responsible for implementing desegregation should also implement a program of informing the public about the benefits of desegregation and should reassure parents that the safety and welfare of the children will be attended to during desegregation (Broh and Trent, April 1981).

- School building and other facilities should be in good repair; i.e., no student should be re-assigned to a school which is perceived by parents and the community as having inferior facilities (Crain and Hawley, 1981; Rossell et al., April 1981).

- No student should experience a down-grading of quality of instruction or be deprived of educational benefits because of desegregation (Broh and Trent, April 1981).

Research findings indicate that although it should not be used as a reason not to desegregate, stability should be a consideration in planning desegregation. As reflected in the foregoing list, stability promotes the student's education as well as tending to promote family and community support for desegregation and confidence in the schools.

The literature strongly suggests that most of the attention given to local needs/conditions in desegregation planning has been at the district level, less attention given to the school level, and virtually none at the classroom level (Hawley et al., April 1981; Broh and Trent, April 1981; Crain et al., 1981). It appears that this situation adds to the burdens and responsibilities of building-level administrators and classroom teachers, insofar as the likelihood of problems is increased at those levels when not attended to in the plan. It follows then that these principals and teachers need more IE support in dealing with the problems.

Other than in student reassignment techniques and curricular concerns (as with compensatory and remedial programs) already discussed, little about local needs and conditions was said in the examined orders or plans. What was included, was schools or grade level on a district-wide level, rather than by schools or grade level (Table 4-D). Three court orders contain some mention of local needs. One order simply called attention to "community apprehension" about the desegregation process. The two others mandated the appointment of a bi-racial and a tri-racial committtee to advise their respective districts in drawing up and implementing the plan. Two district plans, one voluntary, specified the use of tri-ethnic committees to assist the board in formulating and implementing the plan.

k. Parent Involvement or Community Relations

Few if any school officials would disagree that it is important to establish home and school communication and cooperation (Forehand and Ragosta, July 1976; Crain et al., 1982). The importance of parental involvement in school desegregation, both from the standpoint of the individual student's well-being, as well as the standpoint of successful

desegregation is well documented (Forehand and Ragosta, July 1976; Broh and Trent, April 1981; Hawley et al., April 1981).

The need for community involvement and support in the desegregation process is also clearly recognized (Broh and Trent, April 1981; Hawley et al., April 1981; Williams and Anderson, April 1981; Crain et al., 1982). It may be that community support is the key to success for effective desegregation (Community Relations Service, May 1976).

A number of guides exist for helping to promote both parental and community involvement and support for effective desegregation, e.g., Forehand and Ragosta (July 1976); Community Relations Service (May 1976); Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools (February 1976); and King (1981). Quick (February 1980) is a useful guide for parental involvement in the high school.

The importance of parent and community involvement in--or at least, support for--desegregation was apparent in a number of the court orders and plans examined. In 11 instances trial judges called attention to the need for concern about parental or community support (Table 4-D). Four of the court-mandated techniques required the appointment of an individual or group of individuals to serve as conduits of communication:

- Tri-ethnic committee (2)
- Bi-ethnic committee (3)
- Director of public relations (1)
- Committee to discuss... (1)

It seems apparent that the groups were intended also to provide community input in the desegregation process.

The districts' plans contained all of the court-mandated techniques plus others for the communication and cooperation with parents and/or community:

- Parent orientation at their children's school
- Public meetings to review zonings and hear protests or comments
- Child study groups to include parents
- Teacher-parent conferences (2)
- School-home visits
- Family homework policy

1. Inservice Education

Most school staffs are not prepared for the new experiences brought by desegregation. As discussed with regard to multi-cultural education earlier, many if not most, educators are unfamiliar with their new students and new group dynamics which they must deal with as a result of desegregation. Some inservice is necessary just to become familiar with the details of the desegregation plan. Well-planned and implemented training programs are also necessary to provide knowledge, and skills, as well as support to cope with change itself (B. H. Banks, Jr., 1977).

Problems attendant to measuring the effect of inservice training on student outcomes make it difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of such training on student achievement (Brinkerhoff, April 1981). There is some evidence that assesses the effects of desegregation specific programs in terms of perceived relationships between training and the increase of student achievement and the improvement of student-teacher relations. Hawley et al. (April 1981) makes a reasonable argument that if training for desegregation influences changes in participants' attitudes, behaviors, and skills, those developments will result in changes in school climate. These changes in school climate will in turn facilitate improvement of student attitudes, behavior, and achievement (see also Rossell et al., April 1981;

and Broh and Trent, April 1981). Helpful guidelines as to appropriate inservice content do exist as do guidelines for effective operation of training programs ((Forehand and Ragosta, July 1976; Crain et al. 1981); Hawley et al., April 1981; Williams, 1980; King, in press).

It is not to be expected that full-blown inservice programs will be embodied in desegregation court orders or district plans. It does appear that orders and plans should specify that there will be desegregation-specific training and indicate general outlines and content of the program. Only one court order mandated inservice training, that was in human relations (Table 4-D). One other district, not ordered to do so, also called for human relations training for staff across all levels (Table 4-D). That second district also specified training across all levels in two other content groups: (1) training in cultural awareness, stereotyping, and race relations, and (2) training for evaluation and use of multi-ethnic materials. Two other districts indicated orientation for desegregation and one called for training to implement desegregation. Only one other district stated in its plan that it would train any of its staff. It specified social studies training for its elementary teachers (Table 4-A).

Additional discussion of inservice education in the plans is in a discussion of Research Question #8.

D. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Discussion of Results with Regard to Research Questions

Discussion in this section is organized by research question.

1) What has research said about the usefulness of educational components in desegregation plans?

The project's search of the literature located only one study of the usefulness of any educational components in desegregation plans. This was by the Research and Evaluation Department of the Detroit Public Schools "Product Evaluation of the Inservice Training Component of the Detroit Desegregation Court Order" (Stavros, Denny, April 1981). On the basis of information gathered through four annual surveys of school staff of all levels and students in grades 6-12, during 1977, 1978, 1978, and 1980, the following conclusions were reported: (1) student race relations improved in middle school and high school levels; findings were inconclusive with regard to elementary students; (2) findings with regard to effects on relations between students and staff were inconclusive; (3) race relations between school staff showed improvement; (4) incidence of racial favoritism in teachers' treatment of Black and White students decreased in middle school and high school; it was not evaluated at the elementary level; (5) more than one-half of the instructional staff gained knowledge about racial/ethnic groups in their schools; (6) high school teachers showed considerable improvement in their ability to prevent disruptive behavior, middle school teachers showed a little improvement, and elementary teachers no improvement; and (7) more than one-half of the teaching staff showed improvement in their ability to resolve conflicts among students.

Research findings for each of the 12 educational components, not mandated in desegregation plans but nevertheless used in desegregated/

desegregating schools, was discussed in the preceding Results Section C. Each component was supported by the literature. Some of the literature, including the WIEDS Guidelines, has detail on a number of component techniques not included in any of the plans or orders, for example, use of the media in community relations.

2) To what extent have court-ordered desegregfation plans incorporated educational components? What were these components?

The extent of component incorporation in plans is discussed in the Results, above. It is represented below in Table 5 by frequency of their use in orders and plans.

TABLE 5

Component	Frequency
Quality of Education	8
Multi-cultural education	4
Curriculum	17
Magnet school	9
Extracurricular	5
Counseling	4
Discipline	5
Local Needs/Conditions	11
Parent Involvement/Community Relations	19
Inservice education	9
	91

Table 5 affords a relative comparison of frequency of uses of the components. The Parent Involvement/Community Relations (N=19) and Curriculum (N=17) components were most frequently used. Data on Table 6, however, show that four of the districts, fewer than one-third, accounted for 10, more than half, of the total uses. Thus, use of the Parent Involvement/Community Relations techniques was unevenly distributed among the 15 sets of plans examined.

TABLE 6

FREQUENCIES OF USE OF TECHNIQUES USED WITHIN COMPONENTS
(OMITTING STUDENT AND FACULTY REASSIGNMENT)
BY ETHNIC GROUPS OF DISTRICTS

ETHNIC GROUPING OF DISTRICTS	TECHNIQUES WITHIN EDUCATIONAL COMPONENT (Combincd orders and plans)	Quality of Education	Multi-cultural Education	Curriculum	Magnet School	Extracurricular	Counseling	Discipline	Local Needs/Conditions	Parent Involvement/Community Relations	inservice Education	TOTAL	*AVERAGES OF COMPONENT USE BY EACH COMPONENT IN GROUPING
BI-ETHNIC													
Black - White (8 Districts)		1	2	2	7	3	2	1	6	8	6	38	4.75
Hispanic - Anglo (1 District)		0	1	1	0	0	1	4	1	1	0	9	9.00
TRI-ETHNIC													
Black - Hispanic - Anglo (4 Districts)		7	1	13	2	2	1	0	2	10	3	41	10.25
Black - Native American - Anglo (2 Districts)		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	1.50
TOTALS		8	4	17	9	5	4	5	1	19	9	91	

*Averages are computed by dividing the number of districts within the ethnic grouping into the total uses of component techniques by the districts in that grouping.

The four components with the lowest numbers of techniques used were Multi-cultural Education (N=4), Counseling (N-4), Extracurricular Activities (N=5), and Discipline (N=5). These components had no techniques used in most of the 15 districts. Eleven district plans contained nothing on Multi-cultural Education; the same 11 contained nothing on Counseling; 10 districts contained no use of techniques to desegregate Extracurricular activities; and 13 districts did not deal with Discipline in their desegregation plans.

Use of techniques within the other components also tended to be concentrated in relatively few districts. Four districts accounted for the eight uses of Quality of Education. And five districts' plans contained the nine uses of Inservice Education for desegregation.

3) Does the court order specify local needs and conditions as a basis for the plan's remedies? What are these needs? Are the remedies based on these needs?

The court orders implicitly dealt with two types of needs. One set of needs were those of the segregation victims being considered, i.e., the minority children. Ideally, the needs of the children would be addressed by appropriate use of each of the twelve educational components, including student and staff reassignment, considered in this study. The other set of needs relate to school and/or district needs, such as the need for parent and community involvement and support for desegregation. These two sets of needs were addressed to the extent discussed with the previous research question.

Local needs and conditions were specifically mentioned in eight of the court-ordered desegregation plans. One plan noted that "there is community apprehension" but did not elaborate on the situation nor pose a

solution. Tri-ethnic and bi-racial committees were the most frequently incorporated desegregation techniques used to consider what was termed in one plan as "the rights, needs and desires of all segments of the community." It appears that student reassignment techniques was the most explicit consideration reflected in the court orders. Attorneys interviewed indicated that potential White flight was a major consideration in drawing up and sanctioning student reassignment plans. This is a consideration of local conditions and needs of some community members.

4) What are the commonalities and/or differences of educational components in court-ordered desegregation plans with respect to bi-racial settings? Tri-racial settings?

As indicated in Table 6 the Project's 15 site districts include eight Black and White, one Hispanic-Anglo, four Black-Hispanic-Anglo, and two Black-Native American-Anglo districts. Each racial/ethnic group included, makes up at least nine per cent of the enrollment in their respective districts (Table 2). Table 6 also displays cells of groupings by component usage. The largest frequency of use was 13 for four tri-ethnic (Black-Hispanic-Anglo) districts. Eleven of these 13 were in one district, and there were none in another of the four. Thus, nothing about curriculum and desegregation can be generalized about these tri-ethnic districts on the basis of these data. The next highest frequency is also with these four districts, 10 in parent involvement/community relations. With this component there is more distribution of usage among the four districts. Also, the parents and community (both were involved in the techniques) component was initiated in four instances by the courts. The four district plans responded to the court orders. Thus it appears, on the basis of this limited number of cases, that perhaps these courts tended to mandate

parent, and especially, community involvement in Black-Hispanic-Anglo district desegregation.

Another grouping with relatively high frequency for the component of parent and community involvement/relations was found in the eight Black-White bi-racial districts. This averages to about one use per district. But these districts are also involved in six usages of "local needs/conditions," and they had the highest usage of the magnet school component. The relatively high use of this combination of these three components--parent involvement/community relations, local needs/conditions, and magnet schools--may indicate that the courts and the districts had a sensitivity to potential for White flight. Magnet schools are essentially an effort to draw White students to attend school with minorities.

Low frequencies of use may also be significant, and there are several empty cells in Table 6. There are no empty cells for the Black-White districts. But, again, there are more of them (eight) than any other grouping in this study. Average usage across the components for that grouping is 4.75, next to lowest. Lowest usage is for the two Black-Native American-Anglo districts, only three uses across the ten components, for an average of 1.50. One of these districts desegregated voluntarily with a brief plan which contained little more than student reassignment.

The two groupings with the highest averages in uses of educational components are (1) Hispanic-Anglo and (2) Black-Hispanic-Anglo. A variable in these two sets and not in the other two is the presence of Hispanics. Even with this small number of cases, there appears to be a relationship between the presence of Hispanic enrollment and use of educational components. The basis for this relationship is strengthened by the

mandating of parent and community involvement in Black-Hispanic-Anglo districts discussed previously. The literature stresses that effective desegregation of Hispanic students depends on the extent to which Hispanic parents and community members support and participate in planning and implementing desegregation and educational programs for their children (Broh and Trent, April 1981). It may be that those who designed the desegregation plan in these districts with Hispanic students recognized these factors.

5) What is the relationship between different school settings--with respect to ethnic groupings--and the IE content of court-ordered plans?

Of the documents examined, there were only nine instances of specification of inservice training. Training was to occur in six content areas:

(a) Human relations

(b) Training in cultural awareness, stereotyping, race relations

(c) Training for evaluation and use of multiethnic materials

(d) Social studies

(e) Orientation for desegregation

(f) Training to implement desegregation

Each of these content areas is important and recommended by the literature. When effectively planned and implemented, these areas of training could constitute a moderately effective beginning for IE for desegregation. They were not, however, all present in any program for any school or district court order/plan examined. They are distributed over six school districts in two ethnic groupings--bi-ethnic Black and Anglo and tri-ethnic Black-Hispanic-Anglo. Four, almost half, of the uses were in

the earliest plan examined in this study, 1969. The only court-ordered use of IE was in one Black-Hispanic-Anglo district. Given this information, it may be concluded that of the districts specifying the use of IE in their desegregation plans, the eight Black-White bi-ethnic districts and the four Black-Hispanic-Anglo districts specified use of IE more (N=6 and N=3, respectively). Other aspects of the use of IE will be discussed with Research Question #8.

6) How does each court-ordered plan for multi-cultural education compare with the WIEDS Guidelines for Multi-cultural Education?

Multi-cultural education is by definition pervasive. It also has the potential to make educational components more effective. Briefly stated, the WIEDS Multi-cultural Guidelines are:

(a) The attitudes and behavior of teachers and staff affect the academic performance of students

(b) Most teachers, administrators, and other staff need training for desegregation and multi-cultural education

(c) The "melting pot" concept no longer governs; cultural pluralism is more useful in education for a diverse, democratic society

(d) Cultural pluralism should be reflected in the school curriculum, staffing, and all programs and activities.

Awareness of the need for multi-cultural training is indicated to some extent in the district plans previously discussed in research question #5, as specifying training in cultural awareness, stereotyping, race relations, evaluation and use of multi-ethnic materials. "Training to implement desegregation" also should include multi-cultural content. These four elements of multi-cultural education are scattered among four district plans. Most plans contained no information which could be identified as promoting multi-cultural education. This is shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7

DISTRICT DESEGREGATION PLANS FOR MULTI-CULTURAL EDUCATION
COMPARED WITH WIEDS GUIDELINES FOR MULTI-CULTURAL EDUCATION

ALL DISTRICTS

MULTI-CULTURAL EDUCATION	DISTRICT NOS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
a) The attitudes and behaviors of teachers and staff affect the academic performance of students		✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)
b) Most teachers, administrators, and other staff need training for desegregation and multi-cultural education		✓+	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)
c) The "melting pot" concept no longer governs; cultural pluralism is more useful in education for a diverse, democratic society		✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)
d) Cultural pluralism should be reflected in the school curriculum, staffing, and all programs and activities.		✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)

Legend

✓+ = Present
✓ = Minimally Present
(-) = Absent

Table 7 lists the four WIEDS Multi-cultural Guidelines and uses numbers 1-15 to represent the school districts in this study. As shown on this Table, 11 district plans have no reference to multi-cultural education. Three plans, for districts #1, 6, and 14, call for multi-cultural education activities which refer to all four of the Guidelines for Multi-cultural Education. These activities, however, were generally specified only for certain schools. In District #6, for example, the multi-cultural education activities were to take place only in an elementary magnet school and the previously all-minority high school. Thus, it can be concluded that the activities were only minimally present. Only the District #1 plan indicated that all of the district's staff would receiving training to implement desegregation and multi-cultural education.

Given the information gathered in this study it can be concluded that of the 15 district plans examined, multi-cultural education information was present in four of the districts to the extent that all four of the WIEDS Multi-cultural Guidelines were at least minimally present in some of the districts' schools, and generally those schools were where most desegregation, i.e., racial mixing of students and staff, took place. In the 11 other districts, however, there was no information in their plans which related to any of the WIEDS Multi-cultural Education Guidelines.

7) How does each court-ordered plan for desegregation compare with the WIEDS Guidelines for Desegregation?

The WIEDS Guidelines indicate that the following requirements are necessary for effective desegregation:

(a) Affirmative local leadership

(b) Two-way communication

(c) Community involvement in the desegregation process

(d) Approach to desegregtion as an opportunity to improve education

(e) Effective training for all school personnel

(f) All grades in desegregation

(g) Careful and comprehensive planning

(h) Multi-cultural education

Table 8 lists these Guidelines and identifies the school districts in the study with numbers 1-15. There is a great deal that judges and school leaders involved in developing a school desegregation plan can do to implement these guidelines. A good district plan itself is a product of affirmative and informed district leadership. Affirmative local leadership can be facilitated through a desegregation plan by arranging for local leaders to be on court-appointed monitoring committees or district-appointed task forces. The process of developing local community leaders' support should begin in the remedy development stage of the plan by inviting their input early in the planning.

Local school leadership was reflected at least minimally in twelve of the plans, insofar as the plans also included the presence of most of the other desegregation guidelines. The next test of local leadership lies in the implementation of the plans, and this is not reflected in the plans per se. Local school leadership appeared to be strongest in District #14 (Table 8), a district which desegregated voluntarily. District #7 also developed a strong desegregation plan after three rounds through the federal court system. With more affirmative school leadership, it seems that the district could probably have developed as strong a plan without this much judicial pressure. Districts #12 and #13 lacked sufficient content in their plans to show leadership. It appears that the two

guidelines which were most positively met, i.e., f) All Grades in Desegregation and (g) Careful and Comprehensive Planning, are more attributable to the courts than to district leadership.

Two-way communication and community involvement should be fostered in the process of developing the desegregation plan. Only District #14, desegregating voluntarily, stipulated public meetings so that those who have the responsibility for implementing desegregation could interact with community members to discuss the plan, ask and answer questions, and hear criticism of and suggestions for the implementation of the plan.

Seven districts had plans devoid of information which would indicate any community-related communication or involvement (Table 8). Seven other districts planned community relations and involvement through court-ordered tri-ethnic committees (two districts), bi-racial committees (three districts), a director of public relations to inform the community (one district), and a committee to discuss the framework of the plan (one district). One other district plan stated that the district would offer parents an orientation at their children's schools. One other district plan indicated it would involve parents through a "family homework policy."

Four of the district plans had no information indicating that the districts approached desegregation as an opportunity to improve education (Table 8). Ten other districts, however, included provisions in their plans which indicated that efforts would be made to improve education either through magnet schools or improvement of the curriculum. The five districts with plans which indicated the strongest commitment to improving education (shown on Table 8, line d with ✓+) were most specific about how improvements were to be made. These plans included, for examples, a bilingual-bicultural program or a magnet program.

The inclusion of two other guidelines are discussed in other research questions. Multi-cultural education is discussed with Research Question #6. Staff training in included with Research Question #8.

The WIEDS Guidelines for Desegregation were developed from an extensive data base, drawing from the experiences--the mistakes and successes--of people in thousands of schools and communities; we now know that a great deal may be done to help provide equal educational opportunity for all children, head off some problems, solve others more easily, and improve the education process while we are about it.

In summary, a comparison of the 15 district desegregation plans with the WIEDS Desegregation Guidelines shows areas where the plans could be improved. The presence of affirmative school leadership was shown in eleven plans, but was strong in only one. Plans for two-way communication the community were lacking in seven of the district plans, and were minimally present in seven others. This guideline was considerably present in only one plan. Examination of the 15 plans for information about involving the community in the desegregation process provide findings similar to those with regard to two-way communication. One district indicated that the community would be involved, but that district's plan posited no two-way communication with the community. Five of the plans examined were concerned primarily with the reassignment of students and showed no consideration of how education might be enhanced in the process. Ten other district desegregation plans did show some consideration of ways to improve education. All 15 sets of plans included grades 1-12 in their desegregation. All but one of the plans showed evidence of some care in the planning.

8) How does each court-ordered plan for IE compare with the WIEDS Guidelines for IE?

Preparing educators to function successfully in a multi-cultural setting is a professional challenge. Until all are effectively trained in schools of education, it can only be done through inservice training. While a review of this literature discloses virtually no convergence of conclusions, there is near consensus on one point: the state of inservice training practice is deplorable, even though much is known about sound principles for effective training practices.

In summary, the WIEDS Guidelines for Inservice Education are:

(a) Planning and content of IE should be in response to assessed needs

(b) IE decision-making should involve those affected by the decisions

(c) Budgets should de developed for adequate IE funding, as for any ongoing school program

(d) Location of IE should be determined by training requirements and activities

(e) IE is more effective when it is explicitly supported and attended by district and building administrators

(f) Inservice should be an integral part of the total school program

(g) Incentives for participation in inservice programs should emphasize intrinsic professional rewards, although public funds should pay for IE

(g) IE programs should offer promise of educational improvement and professional growth

(i) Program goals should be specific and clear

(j) IE should be based on developmental, rather than a deficit, model

(k) IE programs should be heuristic and locally adaptive

(l) Implementation of IE should model good teaching

(m) Trainers should be competent and suited to the situation

(n) Outside agencies/consultants are sources of technical assistance and expertise

(o) Evaluation of IE should be a systematic, ongoing, collaborative process to help improve programs

Table 9 also lists these guidelines and shows their substantial presence, minimal presence, or absence in the plan of each district. In eight of the plans no information was found pertaining to inservice education. Two other districts' plans (#2 and #15) indicated only two guidelines to be observed with regard to teacher IE: that the training would be based on their needs (neither plan included needs assessment) and the training would help improve education for minority children. Three of the districts' plans, however, had some information relating to substantial portions of the 15 IE guidelines: District #8 (with 11 guidelines), #11 (with 3 guidelines) and #14 (with 14 guidelines).

Generally among the 15 plans, there was no prevalent use of any one guideline. The most frequently used guideline (N=7) was the first, (a) stipulating that IE should be based on assessed needs. The next most frequently used was guideline (h); six districts planned training which would offer promise of educational improvement, but only two of these mentioned professional growth.

Some of the IE guidelines relate to finer points of staff development, and it is not surprising that they might not be included in many plans at this level of planning. Nevertheless, each guideline was included, although minimally, in at least one plan.

In summary, four districts' plans included sufficient guidance for IE as to form a firm basis for training for at least a portion of the staff (generally teachers). The other 11 districts' plans, however, did not

TABLE 9

DISTRICT PLANS FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION
COMPARED WITH THE NEEDS GUIDELINES FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION

Legend
✓ = Present
✓- = Minimally Present
(-) = Absent

In-service Education / DISTRICTS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
a Planning for and content of IE should be in response to assessed needs;	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	✓
b IE decision-making should involve those affected by the decisions;	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)
c Budgets should be developed for adequate IE funding, as for any ongoing school program;	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)
d Location of IE should be determined by training requirements and activities	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)
e IE is more effective when it is explicitly supported and attended by district and building administrators	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)
f Inservice should be an integral part of the total school program;	✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	✓+	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)
g Incentives for participation in in-service programs should emphasize intrinsic professional rewards, although public funds should pay for IE;	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)
h IE programs should offer promise of educational improvement and professional growth;	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	✓
i Program goals should be specific and clear;	✓+	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)
j IE should be based on developmental, rather than a deficit model;	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
k IE programs should be heuristic and locally adaptive;	✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
l Implementation of IE should model good teaching;	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
m Trainers should be competent and suited to the situation;	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)
n Outside agencies/consultants are sources of technical assistance and expertise;	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)
o Evaluation of IE should be a systematic, ongoing, collaborative process to help improve programs.	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	(-)

provide adequate guidance for desegregation-related inservice education.

9) What are the limitations of court-ordered components?

One problem is that of monitoring the implementation of the components. Much of this problem could be prevented by the court order. The court order should include the appointment of a desegregation monitoring committee and define its duties (Hughes et al., 1980). This could also help prevent second generation problems (which frequently result from first generation lack of adequate planning), or at least lead to their early identification and resolution.

Another limitation of court-ordered components is that the judge may be ill-equipped for the task. This problem is pointed out in the findings of several desegregation studies. They also propose a remedy; as Monte and Laue (May 1977) point out, sound research findings should prove invaluable to judges in prescribing a plan for desegregation.

2. Conclusions

The hypothesis for this study:

> Court-ordered desegregation plans in the SEDL region do not specify educational components (e.g., multi-cultural education and inservice education) in sufficient detail for use by desegregating and/or desegregated schools and districts, and conversely, school district plans do not contain sufficient detail about educational components for the courts to decide whether the district is in compliance,

appears to be supported by the data. For example, the 15 plans examined in the study are generally lacking in information on inservice education and multi-cultural education, particularly the latter. Research literature strongly indicates that both of these components are important to preventing second generation desegregation problems and to facilitating the process of integration. Inservice training is necessary to bring about

multi-cultural education and the improvements needed in curricular, extracurricular, counseling, and other school programs to maximize their benefits to all students. These benefits are substantial: (1) enhanced academic achievement for minority children while relatively advantaged majority children continue to learn at the same or higher rate, (2) a more positive self-concept for minority children, and (3) more positive racial attitudes by minority and majority students.

It seems evident that some school districts in this study are making progress towards integration despite the lack of specific guidelines in their orders or plans. It may be, however, that more progress with fewer problems might be made if there were more effective guidelines. Plaintiffs and defendants in some of the cases have gone back to the courts several times to clarify, add to, and/or make adjustments to court orders. Responsibility for this should be shared. Defendant districts should take more initiative in desegregation, e.g., in implementing multi-cultural education. Plaintiffs, on the other hand, should be more specific in asking the courts for remedies; judges can rule only on what is asked for.

It seems reasonable that we can learn from the schools which use effective practices such as multi-cultural education and appropriate IE, and make progress in student achievement and race relations. Much is known about what works for these schools and why. It is from the effective practices in these successful schools that the WIEDS guidelines were derived. Recent empirical research in other successful schools has validated the practices.

More needs to be known about successful practices, but there is also a need to find out how to get what we do know about good practices in general

use in desegregated schools. Crain and Hawley (April 1981) have identified seven audiences who can create or at least influence desegregation policy and practice. These are:

(1) the plaintiffs and their attorneys in school desegregation suits,

(2) judges,

(3) school administrators,

(4) classroom teachers,

(5) parents and other citizens,

(6) federal and state program administrators,

(7) federal, state, and local legislators.

Although they are diverse audiences, it may be assumed that they are all interested in improving practices in school desegregation and education. It is anticipated that many people in these audiences will be interested in the findings of this study and in the WIEDS Guidelines.

Among these audiences, two should be useful allies in efforts to reach the others. These two are state education agencies and legislatures. Williams and Anderson (April 1981) argue that many leaders in these agencies and legislatures are supportive of desegregation and multi-cultural education, contrary to what some desegregation experts have indicated. That may be one of the reasons why the state agencies are generally overlooked as vehicles for advancing school improvement within a framework of desegregation. Ways need to be found to harness state resources with local desegregation efforts. Here, also, varied audiences need to be addressed--chief state school officers, state board of education members, chairpersons of educational committees in the legislatures, and probably others.

It seems more important than ever that state-level interest, resources, and leadership be developed regarding improvement of education in desegregated schools. Federal direction for desegregation is diminishing, but the constitutional mandate remains. Many school districts are faring well with desegregation, but others need assistance.

Identification of practices which are successful in desegregated and/or desegregating schools seem likely to have implications for general educational processes and their outcomes. These practices include, inter alia, paying attention to the importance of student self-esteem, promoting positive teacher attitudes and behavior toward students, and having a school climate that accepts individual and group differences. More, and more focused, research is needed to investigate the implications of desegregated/desegregating school improvement efforts for schools in general.

3. Recommendations

In order to help secure the benefits of integreated multi-cultural education, it is recommended that plaintiffs, their attorneys, and judges in school desegregation cases should help develop desegregation plans which contain specific guidelines for multi-cultural education and effective inservice training as part of the desegregation process. School staff members; boards of education; schools of education; parents and other citizens; and federal, state, and local educational program administrators and federal, state, and local legislators should work in their respective areas of responsibility to improve the quality of education by helping to establish multi-cultural education programs and effective inservice training in schools.

TABLE 8

DISTRICT PLANS FOR DESEGREGATION
COMPARED WITH WIEDS GUIDELINES FOR DESEGREGATION

Legend
✓+ = Present
✓ = Minimally Present
(-) = Absent

DESEGREGATION / DISTRICTS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
a) Affirmative local leadership	✓	✓	✓	(-)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	✓+	✓
b) Two-way Communication with Community	✓	(-)	(-)	(-)	✓	✓	✓	(-)	✓	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	✓+	(-)
c) Community Involvement in the Desegregation Process	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	✓	✓	✓	(-)	✓	✓	✓	(-)	(-)	✓+	(-)
d) Approach to Desegregation as an Opportunity to Improve Education	✓	✓+	(-)	(-)	✓	✓+	✓+	✓	✓+	(-)	✓	(-)	✓	+	(-)
e) Effective Training for All (1) School Personnel															
f) All Grades in Desegregation (1-12)	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+	✓+
g) Careful and Comprehensive Planning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓+	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	(-)
h) Multi cultural Education (2)															

(1) See Table #9 with Research Question #8

(2) See Table 7 with Research Question #6

C. REFERENCES

Alabama Law Review, issue on "Symposium: Judicially Managed Institutional Reform," 32, Winter 1981.

Allport, Gordon W. The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954.

Altschuler, Alan A. Community Control: The Black Demand for Participation in Large American Cities. New York: Western, 1970.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Multicultural Education and Ethnic Studies in the U.S.: An Analysis and Annotated Bibliography of Selected Documents in ERIC. Washington, D.C.: AACTE and ERIC, 1976.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. "No One Model American." Journal of Teacher Education, Winter 1973.

Amidon, E. C., and J. B. Hough, eds. Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1967.

Appleton, N. Multiculturalism and the Courts. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1978.

Aragon, John. "An Impediment to Cultural Pluralism: Culturally Different Children." in Cultural Pluralism in Education: A Mandate for Change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Meredith Corp., 1973.

Arciniega, Tomas A. "The Thrust Toward Pluralism: What Progress?" Educational Leadership, December 1975.

Armor, David J. "The Evidence on Busing." The Public Interest, 28, Summer, 1972.

Armor, David J. "White Flight and the Future of School Desegregation," in W. G. Stephan and J. R. Feagin, eds., Desegregation: Past, Present, and Future. New York: Plenum Press, 1980.

Banks, James A. "Cultural Pluralism: Implications for Curriculum Reform." Revised version of paper presented at the Conference on Pluralism in a Democratic Society, sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. New York, April 1975.

Banks, James A. Teaching the Black Experience: Methods and Materials. Belmont, Calif.: Fearon Publishers, 1970.

Banks, James A. Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies. 2nd edition. Boston, Mass.: Allyn & Bacon, Inc. 1975.

Banks, James A., ed. Education in the 80's: Multiethnic Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1981.

Banks, James A., ed. Teaching Ethnic Studies: Concepts and Strategies. National Council for the Social Studies, 43rd Yearbook, 1973.

Banks, James A., and J. B. Grambs, eds. Black Self-Concept: Implications for Education and Social Science. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1972.

Baptiste, P. H. "Multicultural Education Evolvement at the University of Houston: A Case Study," in Pluralism and the American Teacher, ed. by F. E. Klassen and D. M. Gollnick. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977

Barnes, W. J. "Student-Teacher Dyadic Interaction in Desegregated High School Classrooms." University of Texas at Austin Dissertation, 1973.

Becker, Theodore L., ed. The Impact of Supreme Court Decisions: Empirical Studies. New York, London, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Becker, Theodore L., and Malcolm M. Feeley. The Impact of Supreme Court Decisions: Empirical Studies. Second Edition. New York, London, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Beegle, Charles W., and Roy A. Edelfelt, eds. Staff Development: Staff Liberation. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1977.

Bell, Derrick A. Jr. "Commentary. Serving Two Masters: Integration Ideals and Client Interests in School Desegregation Litigation," from Limits of Justice: The Courts' Role in School Desegregation. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1978.

Bell, Derrick A., Jr. "School Litigation Strategies for the 1970's: New Phases in the Continuing Quest for Quality Schools." Wisconsin Law Review, 1970.

Bell, Derrick A., Jr. "Serving Two Masters: Integration Ideals and Client Interests in School Desegregation Litigation," in The Limits of Justice: The Courts' Role in Desegregation., ed. by Howard Kalodner and James Fishman. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1978.

Bennett, Christine. "Interracial Acceptance in Desegregated Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, May 1979.

Bennett, Christine. "Teaching Students as They Would be Taught: The Importance of Cultural Perspective." Educational Leadership, January 1979.

Berger, Curtis. "Away from the Court House and Into the Field: The Odyssey of a Special Master." Columbia Law Review, 78, 1978.

Berger, Raoul. Government by Judiciary. The Transformation of the Fourteenth Amendment. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Berger, Raoul. "The Role of The Supreme Court," in School Law for a New Decade, ed. by M. A. McGhehey. Topeka, Kansas: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, 1981.

Berman, Paul, and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. IV: The Findings in Review. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, April 1975.

Berman, Paul, and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, et al. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VII: Factors Affecting Implementation and Continuation. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, April 1977.

Berman, Paul, and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, May 1978.

Bickel, Alexander M. The Least Dangerous Branch: The Supreme Court at the Bar of Politics. Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1962.

Bickel, Alexander M. The Morality of Consent. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1975.

Bickel, Alexander M. The Supreme Court: The Idea and the Progress. New York, Evanston, and London: Harper & Row, 1970.

Blackwell, James E. "Social Factors Affecting Educational Opportunity for Minority Group Students," in Beyond Desegregation: Urgent Issues in The Education of Minorities. New York, N.Y.: The College Entrance Examination Board, 1978.

Bonjean, C. M., et al. Sociological Measurement: An Inventory of Scales and Indices. San Francisco, California: Chandler Publishing Co., 1967.

Braddock, Jomills H., and James McPartland. Three Reports on New Directions in School Desegregation. Baltimore: Center for Social organization of Schools, the Johns Hopkins University, 1981.

Brandt, Richard M., ed. Cultural Pluralism and Social Change: A Collection of Position Papers, Report V, Inservice Teacher Education Report V. Syracuse, N.Y.: National Dissemination Center, Syracuse University, 1976.

Braun, Miranda. "Toward Teacher Training for 'Desegregated' Schools: Organization, Content, and Sociocultural Context." Education and Urban Society, Vol. 9, No. 3, May 1977.

Brinkerhoff, Robert O. "Child Change: Attributing Educational Gains to Personal Preparation Programs." Discrepancy Digest, Vol. 4, April 1981.

Broh, C. Anthony, and William T. Trent. Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume VI: Qualitative Literature and Expert Opinion on School Desegregation. Nashville, Tenn: Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, April 1981.

Brookover, W., et al. Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement III: Relationship of Self-Concept to Achievement in High School. U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 2831. East Lansing, Michigan: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1967.

Brophy, J. E., and T. L. Good. Teacher-Child Dyadic Interaction: A Manual for Coding Classroom Behavior. Report Series No. 27. Austin: The University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1969.

Brown, Frank. "School Integration in the 1980's: Resegregation, Quality Educcation, and Black English." Paper presented at NOLPE Annual Convention, Houston, Texas, November 1981.

Browning, R. Stephen, ed. From Brown to Bradley: School Desegregation 1954-1974. Cincinnati, Ohio and Washington, D.C.: Jefferson Law Book Company, 1975.

California State Department of Education. Guide for Multicultural Education: Content and Context. Sacramento, Calif.: California State Department of Education, 1977.

Candoli, I. C. "An Urban Superintendent Looks at School Desegregation." Theory Into Practice, 7, 1, February 1978, pp. 17-22.

Cardenas, Jose A. " Desegregation and the Mexican American," in Desegregation and Education Concerns of the Hispanic Community. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, June 1977.

Cardenas, Jose A. "Fifth Circuit Rules in U. S. v. Texas." Intercultural Development Research Association Newsletter, August 1982.

Carey, Phillip. "The Impact of the Implemention of Brown vs. Tokepa Decision on American Society, 1955-1980," Negro Education Review, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 5-14, January 1981. EJ 243 343.

Carney, Maureen F. Inservice Education for Desegregation: A Review of the Literature. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, November 1979.

Carney, Maureen F., ed., et al. Inservice Training in Desegregated School Districts: Eastern Region Case Studies. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, August 1979.

Carney, Maureen F., ed., et al. Inservice Training in Desegregated School Districts: Midwest Region Case Studies. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, August 1979.

Carney, Maureen F., ed., et al. Inservice Training in Desegregated School Districts: Western Region Case Studies. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, August 1979.

Case, Charles W. "History of the Desegregation Plan in Boston," in The Future of Big City Schools, ed. by Daniel U. Levine and Robert J. Havighurst, pp. 153-76. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1977.

Castañeda, Alfredo, et al. The Educational Needs of Minority Groups. Lincoln, Neb.: Professional Educators Publications, Inc. 1974.

Chayes, Abram. "The Role of the Judge in Public Law Litigation." Harvard Law Review, Vol. 89, No. 7, May 1976.

Chesler, M. A., et al. Making Desegregation Work - A Professional's Guide to Effecting Change. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1981.

Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools. Citizens Guide to Desegregation. February 1976.

Clark, D. L., and M. A. Amidt. Opportunities for Schools of Education to Foster Practitioner Involvement in the Improvement of Teaching. 1981.

Clasby, Miriam. "School Policy As It Enhances Education in a Desegregated School: Or the Researchers Have Let Us Down." Paper delivered to "The Way It Is" Conference sponsored by the University of Pittsburgh General Assistance Center on School Desegregation and Conflict, October 24-25, 1974, Monroeville, Pennsylvania.

Clothier, Grant, et al. New Dimensions in Multicultural Education. Kansas City, Missouri: Midwest Educational Training and Research Organization, 1978.

Coleman, James S., et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Community Relations Service (of the) U. S. Department of Justice, and National Center for Quality Integrated Education. Desegregation Without Turmoil: The Role of the Multi-Racial Community Coalition in Preparing for Smooth Transition. New York: The National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1976.

Cox, Archibald. The Role of the Supreme Court in American Government. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Cortés, Carlos. E. "The Societal Curriculum and the School Curriculum: Allies or Antagonists?" Educational Leadership, April 1979.

Cortés, Carlos E., et al. Understanding You and Them: Tips for Teaching about Ethnicity. Boulder, Colorado: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, 1976.

Crain, Robert L., and Willis D. Hawley. Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume II: An Agenda for Further Research on Desegregation Strategies. Nashville, Tenn: Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, April 1981.

Crain, Robert L., Rita E. Mahard, and Ruth E. Narot. Making Desegregation Work: How Schools Create Social Climates. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1982.

Crowson, Robert L. "Hills vs. Gautreaux: Implications for Education." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 58, No. 7, March 1977.

Cunningham, Luvern L., and Lila N. Carol. "Court Ordered Monitoring of School Desegregation." Theory Into Practice, Vol. 17, No. 1, February 1978.

Damico, Sandra Bowman, et al. "Effects of School Organizational Structure On Interracial Friendships in Middle Schools," Journal of Educational Research, 74, 1981.

Datta, Lois-ellen. "Damn the Experts and Full Speed Ahead: An Examination of the Cases Against Directed Development and for Local problem-Solving." Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, Draft for Discussion, December 28, 1978.

Davidson, D. G. "Better In-Service Programs for School Administrators." The Clearinghouse, April 1973.

Davis, James A. "Busing." Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Effects of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of School Desegregation, Vol. 2. Chicago: National Public Opinion Research Center, 1973, pp. 83-118.

Davis, William J. "Inservice Staff Development Programs for School Needs Assessments and Inservice Programs." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, New Jersey, 1976. ED 119 304.

Davison, Ronald G. "The In-Service Response to Desegregated Schooling: Managing the Instructional Design Problems." Urban Education, July 1974.

De Clue, James A. "The School Desegregation Cases Are Not, Primarily, About Schools." Paper presented to The National Conference of Christians and Jews, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri, February 10, 1977.

Dentler, Robert A. "Desegregation Planning and Implementation in Boston." Theory Into Practice, Volume XVII, No. 1.

Dentler, Robert A. "Desegregation Planning and Implementation in Boston." Theory Into Practice, Volume XVII, No. 1.

Dentler, Robert A., and M. B. Scott. Schools on Trial. Cambridge: ABT Books, 1981.

Desegregation Instruction Unit: Secondary School Teacher Packet, October 1981. ED 202 925.

Devon, Richard F. "Cause for a New Paradigm: Ideology and Salience in Political Socialization Research." The Generator, Volume 12/ Number 3, Spring 1982. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: American Educational Research Association.

Devon, Tonia K. "Removing Myths from Political Socialization Theory: An Internationally Applicable Approach." The Generator, Volume 12/ Number 3, Spring 1982. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: American Educational Research Association.

Dillon, Elizabeth A. "Staff Development: Bright Hope or Empty Promise?" Educational Leadership, December 1976.

Dolbeare, Kenneth. "The Supreme Court and the States: From Abstract Doctrine to Local Behavioral Conformity," from The Impact of Supreme Court Decisions: Empirical Studies, ed. by Theodore L. Becker. New York, London, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Doyle, W. E. "Can Social Science Data Be Used in Judicial Decision-making?" In Education, Social Science and The Judicial Process. Washington, D.C.: National institute of Education, 1976.

Eash, Maurice J., and Sue Pinsur Rasher. "Mandated Desegregation and Improved Achievement: A Longitutinal Study." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 58, No. 5, January 1977.

Edelfelt, Roy A. "Inservice Education of Teachers: Priorities for the Next Decade," Journal of Teacher Education, Fall 1974.

Edelfelt, Roy A., and Margo Johnson, eds. Rethinking Inservice Education. Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association, 1975.

Edelfelt, R., and G. Lawrence. "Inservice Education: The State of the Art," in R. Edelfelt and M. Johnson, eds., Rethinking Inservice Education, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Edelfelt, Roy A., and Brooks Smith. Breakaway to Multidimensional Approaches: Integrating Curriculum Development and Inservice Education. Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1978.

Edelstein, Frederick S. "Federal and State Roles in School Desegregation." Education in Urban Society, May 1977.

Edmonds, Ronald. "Desegregated Schools and the Parent Agenda for Education." Paper presented at Urban Education National Conference on "From Desegregated Schools to Integrated Education," Milwaukee, Wisconsin, July 12, 1979. St. Louis, Missouri: CEMREL, Inc.

Education Daily. "Administrators Come to Capital to Promote Quality Education." September 16, 1982, Vol. 15, No. 179.

Education Daily. "Bell Supports State Action to Reduce Racial Isolation." September 15, 1982, Vol. 15, No. 178.

Education Daily. "Dallas, St. Louis Congressmen Calling Busing Counterproductive." Friday, August 6, Vol. 15, No. 151.

Education Daily. "Missouri Isolated in High Court Fight Over St. Louis Desegregation." Tuesday, August 3, 1982. Vol. 15, No. 148.

Education Daily. "Report Blasts Justice's Civil Rights Enforcement." September 17, 1982, Vol. 15, No. 180.

Eko, Ewa U. Achievement and Promise: Current Impact and Future Prospects of African and Afro-American Studies. Six Institutions' Consortium, Greensboro, N.C. Proceedings of the Fourth Invitational Workshop on African and Afro-American Studies, March 29-31, 1973.

Ely, John Hart. Democracy and Distrust: A Theory of Judicial Review. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England. Harvard University Press, 1980.

Epps, Edgar G. Cultural Pluralism. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1974.

Epps, Edgar. "Effects of Desegregation on Personality Attitudes of Minority Children." Paper presented at Urban Education National Conference on "From Desegregated Schools to Integrated Education," Milwaukee, Wisconsin, July 12, 1979. St. Louis, Missouri: CEMREL, Inc., 1980.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Schools and the Courts, Vol. I and Vol. II. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, 1979.

Evaluation Training Consortium. Instrument Catalog. Kalamazoo, Mich: The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University, 1980.

Evans, R. L., et al. Responsive Teacher Inservice Needs Assessment in an Urban Setting. March 1979. ED 152 731.

Eyler, Janet, Valerie Cook and Leslie Ward. "Segregation Within Desegregated Schools." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March 1982.

Faber, Charles F., and Don Martin, Jr. "Are the Courts Becoming Too Involved in School Affairs?" Contemporary Education, Summer 1979.

Feiman, Sharon, and Robert Floden. "Approaches to Staff Development from Conceptions of Teacher Development." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association, Boston, Mass., April 1980.

Finger, John. "Why Busing Plans Work." School Review, 84, May 1976, pp. 364-372.

Fishman, James J. "The Brooklyn Case. The Limits of Remedial Power: Hart v. Community School 21," from Limits of Justice: The Courts' Role in School Desegregation, ed. by Howard I. Kalodner and James J. Fishman. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1978.

Fishman, James J., Laura Ross and Steven R. Trost. "The Mount Vernon Case. With All Deliberate Delay: School Desegregation in Mount Vernon," from Limits of Justice: The Courts' Role in School Desegregation, ed. by Howard I. Kalodner and James J. Fishman. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1978.

Flygare, Thomas J. "Can Federal Courts Control an Educational Program?" Phi Delta Kappan, April j1976.

Flygare, Thomas J. "Federal Desegregation Decrees and Compensatory Education." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 59, No. 4, pp. 265-6, December 1977.

Flygare, Thomas J. "Schools and the Law: Federal Desegregation Decrees and Compensatory Education." Phi Delta Kappan, December 1977.

Foote, Edward T. "Two Roads Diverged in a Wood, and....," Desegregation Monitoring and Advisory Committee, 1981. ED 210 348.

Forehand, Garlie A., and Marjorie Ragosta. A Handbook for Integrated Schooling. A report prepared under Contract No. OEC-0-73-6341, U.S. Department of HEW/OE, Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation. Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J., 1976.

Forehand, G. A., et al. Final Report: Conditions and Processes of Effective School Desegregation. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1976.

Foster, G. "Elements of an Effective Desegregation Plan," presentation to Des Moines Desegregation Task Force, August 1972.

Frels, Kelly. "Metropolitan Desegregation Remedies: Interdistrict Relief," in School Law for a New Decade, ed. by M. A. McGhehey. Topeka, Kansas: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, 1981.

Fullan, Michael, and Allan Pomfret. "Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation," Review of Educational Research, Winter 1977.

Gage, N. L. "The Yield of Research on Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, November 1978.

Gage, N. L., ed. Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Gagne, Robert M. "Educational Research and Development: How to Influence School Practices," Educational Technology, April 1980.

García, Ernest F. Chicano Cultural Diversity: Implications for CBTE, 1974. ED 091 375.

García, Ricardo L. "Fostering a Pluralistic Society Through Multi-Ethnic Education." Fastback 107. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1978.

Gay, Geneva. "Curriculum for Multicultural Teacher Education," in Pluralism and the American Teacher: Issues and Case Studies. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

Gay, Geneva. Differential Dyadic Interactions of Black and White Teachers with Black and White Pupils in Recently Desegregated Classrooms. A Function of Teacher and Pupil Ethnicity. Unpublished O.E. Project No. 2F113, January 1974.

Gay, Geneva. "Teachers' Achievement Expectations of Classroom Interactions with Ethnically Different Students," Contemporary Education, Spring 1975.

Gibbs, Sandra Elaincia. College and University English Departments and English Major Preparation in Black Literature. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1974.

Gill, Robert L. "Brown II vs. Board of Education of Topeka: Its Human Advances and Human Tragedies, 1955-1980." Negro Educational Review, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 15-55, January 1981.

Gill, Robert L. "The Effects of the Burger Court Decisions Upon the Lives of Black Families." Negro Educational Review, Vol. 32, No. 3-4, pp. 230-51, Jul-Oct 1981. EJ 257 343.

Glazer, Nathan. "Is Busing Necessary?" Commentary, 53, March 1972.

Glazer, Nathan, and Daniel P. Moynihan. Beyond the Melting Pot. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1970.

Good, T. L., and J. E. Brophy. Looking in Classrooms. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Goodlad, John I. The Dynamics of Educational Change. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Goodlad, John I. "Staff Development: The League Model," Theory Into Practice, October 1972.

Goodlad, John I. "What Goes On in Our Schools?" Educational Researcher, 1977.

Gould, Stephen J. The Mismeasure of Man. New York: W. W. Norton, 1982.

Graglia, Lino A. Disaster by Decree. The Supreme Court Decisions on Race and the Schools. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1976.

Grant, Carl A. "Classroom Socialization: The Other Side of a Two-Way Street," Educational Leadership, April 1979.

Green, Robert L. "The Social Responsibility of Psychology." The Black Scholar, July-August 1975.

Green, Robert L., Margaret A. Parsons, and Frances S. Thomas. "Desegregation: The Unfinished Agenda." Educational Leadership, January 1981.

Greer, Colin. The Great School Legend. New York, N.Y.: Basic Books, 1972.

Gress, J. R., and J. D. Inglis. Implementation and Assessment of a School Staff Development Model for Changing School Climate and Teacher Stress. 1982.

Griffin, Gary A. "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Staff-Development Programs," Teachers College Record, September 1978, pp. 126-139.

Griffore, Robert J., John H. Schweitzer, Susan Jacob, and Joseph M. Wisenbaker. "Factors Associated with Black Parent Participation and Non-Participation in Voluntary School Desegregation." Educational Research Quarterly, Vol. 4, No. 4, Winter 1979.

Guerrier, Charles. "Is There a Court of Last Resort?" Paper prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March 1982.

Hain, Elwood. "The Detroit Case. Sealing Off the City: School Desegregation in Detroit," from Limits of Justice: The Courts' Role in School Desegregation, ed. by Howard I. Kalodner and James J. Fishman. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1978.

Hall, Gene E., and Susan F. Loucks. "A Developmental Model for Determining Whether the Treatment Is Actually Implemented," American Educational Research Journal, Vol. 14, Summer 1977, pp. 263-293.

Hall, Gene E., and Susan F. Loucks. "A Longitudinal Investigation of Individual Implementation of Educational Innovations." Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1977.

Hall, Gene E., and Susan F. Loucks. "Teacher Concerns as a Basis for Facilitating and Personalizing Staff Development," Teachers College Record, September 1978, pp. 36-53.

Hall, G. E., and W. L. Rutherford. "Concerns of Teachers about Implementing Team Teaching," Educational Leadership, December 1976.

Harris, Ben M. Improving Staff Performance through In-Service Education. Boston, Mass.: Allyn & Bacon, 1980.

Harris, Ben M., and Jane Hill. The Developmental Teacher Evaluation Kit (DeTEK) Handbook. Austin, Texas: National Educational Laboratory Publishers, 1982.

Hawley, Willis D. "Getting the Facts Straight about the Effects of School Desegregation." Educational Leadership, February 1979.

Hawley, Willis D. Teachers, Classrooms, and the Effects of School Desegregation on Effort in School: A "Second Generation" Study. Durham, N.C.: Duke University, Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, April 1976. ED 126 201

Hawley, Willis D., et al. Assessment of Current Knowledge About the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume I: Strategies for Effective Desegregation: A Synthesis of Findings. Nashville, Tenn.: Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, April 1981.

Henderson, Ronald D., Mary von Euler, and Jeffrey M. Schneider. "Remedies for Segregation: Some Lessons from Research." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, July-August, Vol. 3, No. 4, 1981.

Hilliard, Asa G. Restructuring Teacher Education for Multicultural Imperatives. 1974.

Hillman, Stephen, et al. "Teacher Behavior in Desegregated Schools." American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, April 1977. ED 138 670.

Hirschman, Albert O. Exit, Voice, and Loyalty. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970

Horowitz, Donald L. The Courts and Social Policy. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1977.

Howey, Kenneth R. "Current Perspectives and Evolving Trends in Inservice Education in the United States." Paper presented at the U.S. OECD Forum of Education Organization Leaders, NIE-OECD International Seminar on Inservice Eduction of Teachers, Philadelphia, Jun 27-July 2, 1976.

Howsam, Robert B. "The Profession of Teaching," in Issues in Inservice Education: State Action for Inservice. Syracuse, N.Y.: National Council of States on Inservice Education, November 1977.

Howsam, Robert B, et al. Educating a Profession. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Howarth, Les. Project T.E.A.C.H. An Evaluative Study. 1981.

Hudgins, H. C., Jr. "The Many Voices of the Burger Court and School Desegregation." Phi Delta Kappan, November 1978.

Hughes, Larry W., et al. Desegregating America's Schools. New York: Longham, 1980.

Hunt, Martin L., Charles B. McMillan, and Karen L. Worth. "University-School Collaboration in Boston." Integrated Education, 21, pp. 21-23, 1978.

Hunter, William, ed. Multicultural Education through Competency-Based Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974.

Hutson, Harry. Inservice Best Practices: The Learnings of General Education. Bloomington, Ind.: National Inservice Network, February 1979.

Ingersoll, Gary M. "Assessing Inservice Training Needs through Teacher Responses," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 27, No. 2, Summer 1976.

Intriligator, Barbara A. "New Ways of Planning for New Realities: The Collaborative Option." Paper presented at the Annual American Educational Research Association Conference, New York, N.Y., March 19-23, 1982.

Jencks, C. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Jensen, Christopher. "A City Loses Control of Its Schools." American Education, November 1980.

Johnson, Frank M., Jr. "The Role of the Federal Courts in Insitutional Litigation." Alabama Law Review, 32, Winter 1981.

Jones, Leon. From Brown to Boston: Desegregation in Education, 1954-74, Two Volumes. Metuchi, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1979.

Jones, Nancy Baker, et al. Annotated Bibliography of Multi-Ethnic Curriculum Materials. Eight vols. (incl. 6 supplements and index). Columbia, Missouri: Midwest Center for Equal Educational Opportunity, 1974-1977. ED 114 378, ED 114 379, ED 114 380, ED 114 381, ED 129 702, ED 150, 076, ED 144 862, ED 160, 475.

Jones, Nancy Baker, et al. "Case Study: Multicultural Education Training Training for Teachers," in Pluralism and the American Teacher, ed. by F. H. Klassen and D. M. Gollnick. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

Joyce, Bruce, and Beverly Showers. "Improving Inservice Training: The Messages of Research." Educational Leadership, February 1980.

Joyce, Bruce R., and Marsha Weil. Models of Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972, revised 1978.

Kalodner, Howard I., and James J. Fishman. Limits of Justice: The Courts' Role in School Desegregation. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co. (a subsidiary of J. O. Lippincott Co.), 1978.

Kane, Michael B. Minorities in Textbooks: A Study of Their Treatment in Social Studies Texts. Chicago, Ill.: Quandrangle Books, 1970.

Kapel, David E. Assessing a Controversial In-Service Program: An Action Research Approach. 1981.

Katz, Irwin. "Factors Influencing Negro Performance in the Desegregated Schools, in Social Class, Race and Psychological Development, ed. by Martin Deutsch, Irwin Katz, and Arthur Jensen. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

Katz, Irwin. "Review of Evidence Relative to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes." American Psychologist, Vol. 19, 1964.

Katz, William A. "The State of Black Studies in U. S. Schools Today; An Interview with Professor LaMar P. Miller," Equal Opportunity Review, Columbia University, New York, April 1973.

Katz-Garris, Lynda, and Raymond Garris. "Mainstreaming and Desegregation: Past, Present and Future." Negro Educational Review, Vol. 32, No. 3-4, pp. 213-219, Jul-Oct 1981.

Kessel, John H. "Public Perceptions of the Supreme Court," from The Impact of Supreme Court Decisions: Empirical Studies, ed. by Theodore L. Becker. New York, London, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1969

King, A. L. "The Impact of Desegregation and the Need for Inservice Education," in David L. Williams, Jr., ed. Research to Improve Family and School Life, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory Monograph Series. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1981, pp. 1-26.

King, A. L., and Letticia Galindo. "Executive Summary of Final Report on Analyses of Staff Development Programs and Other Strategies to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools, 1978-1979." Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1980. ED 187 783.

King, A. L., et al. Final Report: Ways to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools (WIEDS). Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, November 1979. ED 185 191.

King, A. L., et al. Final Report, Ways to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools (WIEDS), November 1979. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1980. ED 185 191.

King, A. L., and Letticia Galindo. "Identification of Effective Staff Development/Inservice Education Strategies to Integrate Desegregated Schools." A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Mass., April 1980. ED 185 194.

King, James C., et al. "Some Requirements for Successful Inservice Education," Phi Delta Kappan, May 1977.

King, Nicelma J. The Los Angeles Experience in Monitoring Desegregation. Progress and Prospects, 1980. ED 202 973.

King, Nicelma J., et al. Staff Development Programs in Desegregated Settings. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, February 1980.

Kirk, Diana, and Susan Goon. "Desegregation and the Cultural Deficit Model: An Examination of the Literature." Review of Educational Research, Vol. 45, No. 4, Fall 1975.

Kirp, David L. "The Bounded Politics of School Desegregation Litigation." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 51, No. 3, pp. 395-414, August 1981. EJ 250 785.

Kirp, David L. "Law, Politics, and Equal Educational Opportunity: The Limits of Judicial Involvement." Harvard Educational Review, May 1977.

Kirp, David L. Legalism and Politics in School desegregation. 1980.

Kirp, David L. "Race, Politics, and the Courts: School Desegregation in San Francisco." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 46, November 1976.

Kirp, David L. "The San Francisco Case. Multitudes in the Valley of Indecision: The Desegregation of San Francisco's Schools," from Limits of Justice: The Courts' Role in School Desegregation. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1978.

Kirp, David L., and Gary Babcock. "Judge and Company: Court-Appointed Masters, School Desegregation, and Institutional Reform." Alabama Law Review, Volume 32, No. 2, Winter 1981.

Kirp, David L., et al. Judicial Management of School Desegregation Cases: Dallas, St. Louis, Wilmington, Minneapolis, Atlanta, Pasadena, Denver. Final Report. 1979, 843 pp. ED 198 196.

Klassen, Frank H., and Donna M. Gollnick, eds. Pluralism and the American Teacher: Issues and Case Studies. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

Klausmier, Herbert, et al. The Renewal and Improvement of Secondary Education: Concepts and Practices. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Research and Development Center, 1980.

Kluger, Richard. Simple Justice: The History of Brown v. Board of Education and Black America's Struggle for Equality. New York: Alfred A. Knopf., 1976.

Knowles, Malcolm S. The Modern Practice of Adult Education, Revised. Chicago: Association Press, 1980.

Kraft, Michael E., and Mark Schneider, eds. Population Policy Analysis: Issues in American Politics. Lexington, Mass. and Toronto, Canada: Lexington Books, D. C. Heath and Company, 1978.

Kutner, Peter B. "Keyes v. School District Number One: A Constitutional Right to Equal Educational Opportunity?" Journal of Law and Education, Vol. 8, No. 1, January 1979.

Lauerman, Henry C. "The Winston-Salem Case. The Role of the Judiciary in The Desegregation of the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools, 1968-1975," from Limits of Justice: The Courts' Role in School Desegregation. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1978.

Lawrence, Gordon, et al. Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of the Art Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education. Gainesville, Florida: State of Florida Department of Education, 1974.

Levin, B., and P. Moise. "School Desegregation Litigation in the Seventies and the Use of Social Science Evidence: An Annotated Guide," in The Courts, Social Science, and School Desegregation, ed. by B. Levin and W. D. Hawley. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1977.

Levine, Daniel U. Instructional and Organizational Arrangements and Processes for Improving Academic Achievement at Inner City Elementary Schools. Kansas City: University of Missouri at Kansas City, 1981.

Levine, Daniel U., and Robert J. Havighurst, ed. The Future of Big City Schools. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1977.

Little, Judith Warren. "School Success and Staff Development in Urban Desegregated Schools: A Summary of Recently Completed Research." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, Calif., April 1981.

Luke, Robert A. Teacher-Centered In-Service Education: Planning and Products. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1980.

Lowi, Theodore J. The Politics of Disorder. New York and London: Basic Books, Inc., 1971.

McConahay, John B. Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume III: A Proposed National Study of School Desegregation. Nashville, Tenn.: Center For Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, April 1981.

McGhehey, M. A., ed. School Law for a New Decade. Topeka, Kansas: National Organization on Legal Problem of Education, 1981.

McGuigan, Patrick B., and Randall R. Rader, eds. A Blueprint for Judicial Reform. Washington, D.C.: Free Congress Research and Education Foundation, 1981.

McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin, and David D. Marsh. "Staff Development and School Change." Teachers College Record, Vol. 80, No. 1, September 1973, pp. 69-94.

McNeil, John D. "Curriculum: A Field Shaped by Many Faces," Educational Researcher. September 1978.

Mangold, Lana C. "Pupil-Teacher Dyadic Interaction in Desegregated Elementry Classrooms." The University of Texas at Austin: Dissertation 1974.

Marsh, D. D. Innovative Teacher Training for Multicultural Education. Final Report of the Cycle X Teacher Corps Project. October 1977. ED 146 144.

Marsh, William E. "The Indianapolis Case. United States v. Board of School Commissioners," from Limits of Justice: The Courts' Role in School Desegregation, ed. by Howard I. Kalodner and James J. Fishman. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1978.

Marshall, Jon C., et al. Looking at Needs Assessment for Staff Development. Berkeley: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1982.

Mendels, G. E., and J. P. Flanders. "Teacher Expectations and Pupil Performance." American Educational Research Journal, Summer 1973.

Mercer, Jane R. System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment (SOMPA). New York: Psychological Corp., 1979.

Miller, Arthur Selwyn. "On the Need for 'Impact Analysis' of Supreme Court Decisions," from The Impact of Supreme Court Decisions: Empirical Studies, ed. by Theodore L. Becker. New York, London, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Monti, Daniel J., and James H. Laue. "Implementing Desegregation Plans: The Social Scientist as Intervenor." Education and Urban Society, May 1977.

Morgan, David R., et al. Desegregating Public Schools: A Handbook for Local Officials. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1982. ED 215 005.

Morgan, P. R., and James M. McPartland. "The Extent of Class Segregation Within Desegregated Schools," in Center for Social Organization of Schools Report No. 314. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University, August 1981.

Morris, Lee, et al. Adapting Educational Research: Staff Development Approaches. Norman, Oklahoma: Teacher Corps Research Adaptation Cluster, University of Oklahoma, 1979.

Mosley, D. Y., and E. Flaxman. "A Survey of Inservice Desegregation Workshops." Columbia University, New York. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged, DHEW/OE, 1972.

Mosteller, Frederick, and Daniel P. Moynihan, eds. On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Random House, 1972.

National Education Association. Roots of America. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

National Institute of Education. The Desegregation Literature: A Critical Appraisal. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, July 1976.

National Institute of Education. Final Reports of Ethnographic Studies in Five Desegregated Schools, 1972-1978, NIE funded, unpublished, reported in 1977 and 1978.

National Project and Task Force on Desegregation Strategies. "Desegregation: Problems, Successes and Next Steps." A report of the National Association of State Boards of Education, 1979.

Neely, R. How Courts Govern America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.

Nicholson, Alexander M., and Bruce R. Joyce. The Literature on Inservice Teacher Education, III. An Analytic Review, Inservice Teacher Education Report. Syracuse, N.Y.: National Dissemination Center, Syracuse University, 1976.

Nixon, Richard M. "A Message to Congress on School Busing: 17 March 1971," from The Impact of Supreme Court Decisions: Empirical Studies, Second Edition, ed. by Theodore L. Becker and Malcolm M. Feeley. New York, London, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Noar, Gertrude. Sensitizing Teachers to Ethnic Groups. Boston, Mass.: Allyn & Bacon, 1972.

Ogletree, E. J., and B. Mitchell. Legal Issues in School Desegregation, 1981. ED 212 728.

Orfield, Gary. "Desegregation of Black and Hispanic Students from 1968 to 1980." A report to the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States House of Representatives. Washington, D.C.: Joint Center for Political Studies, 1982.

Orfield, Gary. Must We Bus? Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1978.

Ornstein, Allan C. Education and Social Inquiry. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1978.

Ornstein, Allan C., et al. Reforming Metropolitan Schools. Pacific Palisades, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1975.

Passow, Harry A. "New Curricula for Multi-Ethnic Schools." Equal Opportunity Review, Columbia University, New York, N.Y., June 1975.

Pearson, Jessica, and Jeffrey Pearson. "The Denver Case. Keyes v. School District No. 1," from Limits of Justice: The Courts' Role in School Desegregation, ed. by Howard I. Kalodner and James J. Fishman. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1978.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. "Planning for Equal Educational Opportunities: Eliminating Racial Isolation." Harrisburg, Pa.: No date, but after 1975.

Peters, Donald L., et al. The Preschool Teacher as an Adult Learner. 1981.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. "Busing: A Review of the Evidence." Public Interest, 29, Winter 1973.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. "Desegregation to Integration." Presentation to Des Moines Desegregation Task Force, August 1972.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. Racially Separate or Together? New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. "Tension Between the Law and Social Science: An Expert Witness's View," in Schools and the Courts, Vol. I. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1979.

Phillips, A. Craig. "The Emerging Issues on School Desegregation," in Beyond Desegregation: Urgent Issues in the Education of Minorities. New York: The College Entrance Examination Board, 1978.

Pinar, William F. "Notes on the Curriculum Field, 1978," Educational Researcher, September 1978.

Pitner, Nancy J. Training of the School Administrator: State of the Art. An Occasional Paper. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1982.

Purkey, W. W. Self-Concept and School Achievement. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Quick, Sandra. "A Systematic Approach to Improved Parental Involvement at the Secondary Level in a Desegregated School Setting." A paper in Guides, 1980.

Raffel, Jeffrey A. "The Politics of Metropolitan Desegregation: Ordeal by Court Order." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 58, No. 6, February 1977.

Read, Frank T. "Judicial Evolution and the Law of School Integration Since Brown v. Board of Education." Law and Contemporary Problems, Vol. 30, Winter 1975.

Rebell, Michael R., and Arthur R. Block. The Role of the Courts in Educational Policy Making. April 9, 1979, 71 pp. ED 177 683.

Reynolds, William Bradford. "School Desegregation." Statement before the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, House of Representatives, Department of Justice, May 1982.

Rist, Ray C. The Invisible Children: School Integration in American Society. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Rivlin, Harry N., and Milton J. Gold. "Teachers for Multicultural Education." New York, N.Y.: Multicultural Component/Fordham University Teacher Corps, Unpublished Fordham University at Lincoln Center, 1975.

Rodriguez, A. M. "A Comprehensive Approach to the Problems of Bilingual-Bicultural Students," in Beyond Desegregation: Urgent Issues in the Education of Minorities. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978.

Rodriguez, Fred, et al. Mainstreaming a Multicultural Concept into Special Education. Guidelines for Special Education Teacher Trainers. Lawrence, Kan.: University of Kansas, 1980.

Rose, A. M. "The Social Scientist As an Expert Witness." Minnesota Law Review, Vol. 40, pp. 205-18.

Rossell, Christine H. Assessing the Unintended Impacts of Public Policy: School Desegregation and Public Policy. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978.

Rossell, Christine H. "Magnet Schools as a Desegregation Tool: The Importance of Contextual Factors in Explaining Their Success." Urban Education, Vol. 14, 1979.

Rossell, Christine H., et al. Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume V: A Review of the Empirical Research on Desegregation: Community Response, Race Relations, Academic Achievement and Resegregation. Nashville, Tenn.: Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, April 1981.

Rossell, Christine H., and William D. Hawley. "Understanding White Flight from School Desegregation and Doing Something about It," in William D. Hawley, ed., Effective School Desegregation. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1981.

Rubin, Louis J. "A Study on the Continuing Education of Teachers," Instructor Development, 2 parts, March 1970 and May 1970.

Rubin, Louis J., ed. The In-Service Education of Teachers: Trends, Processes, and Prescriptions. Boston, Mass.: Allyn & Bacon, 1978.

Ryor, John, Albert Shanker, and J. T. Sandefur. "Three Perspectives on Inservice Education." Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXX, No. 1, January-February 1979.

St. John, Nancy H. "Desegregation and Minority Group Performance." Review of Educational Research, 40, February 1970, pp. 111-134.

St. John, Nancy H. School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.

Sanchez, Rodolfo B. "A Chicano Perspective on Social Work Curriculum Development, Social Work Education for Economically Disadvantaged Groups in Texas." An Occasional Paper of the Consortium of Texas Schools of Social Work. Austin: University of Texas at Austin, Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, 1972.

Saville-Troike, Muriel. A Guide to Culture in the Classroom. Rosslyn, Va.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1978.

Scheingold, Stuart S. The Politics of Rights: Lawyers, Public Policy, and Political Change. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press 1974.

Schoeny, D. H., and D. Galbreath. Utilizing Community Resources in the Classroom: An In-Service Reference Collection. Flint: C. S. Mott Foundation, 1982.

The School Desegregation in Texas Policy Research Project. School Desegregation in Texas. The Implementation of United States v. State of Texas. Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs Policy Research Project Report Number 51, 1982.

"School and Family Effects on Black and White Achievement: A Reexamination of USOE Data," in On Equality of Educational Opportunity, ed. by Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan. New York: Random House, 1972.

Schnee, Ronald G. "Improving Desegregation Plans." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 62, No. 6, February 1981.

Shapiro, Martin. "The Impact of the Supreme Court Decisions." Journal of Legal Education, Vol. 23, 1971, pp. 77-89.

Silberman, C. Crisis in Black and White. New York: Random House, 1964.

Simmons, Althea T. L. "From Brown to Detroit: Blueprint for Education." Theory Into Practice, Vol. 17, No. 1, February 1978.

Smith, Charles V. "Public School Desegregation and the Law." Social Forces. Vol. 54, Fall 1975.

Smith, Eddie D. "Attitudes of Bibb County Elementary School Teachers Toward Integrated Schools." Unpublished Master's thesis, Fort Valley State College, 1971.

Smith, B. Othanel. Teachers for the Real World. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

Smith, Paul M., Jr. "The Role of the Guidance Counselor in the Desegregation Process." Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 40, Winter 1972.

Smith, Ralph R. "The Boston Case. Two Centuries and Twenty-Four Months: A Chronicle of the Struggle to Desegregate the Boston Public Schools," from Limits of Justice: The Courts' Role in School Desegregation, ed. by Howard I. Kalodner and James J. Fishman. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1978.

Sowell, Thomas. Ethnic America: A History. New York: Basic Books.

"Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives," Teachers College Record, Vol. 80, No. 1, September 1978.

Stavros, Denny. "Product Evaluation of the Inservice Training Component of the Detroit Desegregation Court Order." Detroit: Research and Evaluation Department, Detroit Public Schools, April 1981.

Stayrook, N., et al. Technical Status Report on Staff Development. Final Report. Washingto, D.C.: Department of Education, 1982.

Stent, Madelon D., et al., ed. Cultural Pluralism in Education: A Mandate for Change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Meredith Corporation, 1973.

Stern, Ralph D. "Tha Law and Public Education: Projection for the 1980's." Education and Urban Society, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 211-234, February 1982. EJ 260 934.

Stollee, M. "Integrated Education: Past and Future Perspectives of Research." A paper presented to the Urban Education National Conference, "From Desegregated Schools to Integrated Education," Milwaukee, July 9, 1979.

Strahan, Richard Dobbs. The Courts and the Schools. Lincoln, Neb.: Professional Educators Publications, Inc. 1973.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L. "A Working Paper on Needs Assessment in Evaluation," a paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Evaluation Conference, September 1977.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L., et al. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Phi Delta Kappa Study Committee on Evaluation. Itasca, Ill: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1971.

Sullivan, Allen B. "Cultural Competence and Confidence: A Quest for Effective Teaching in a Multicultural Society." Paper presented at Competency Based Multicultural Project Conference, Norman, Oklahoma, June 1974.

Sutman, Francis X., Eleanor L. Sandstrom, and Francis Shoemaker. "Educating Personnel for Bilingual Settings: Present and Future." Multilingual Education Resource Information and Training Center (MERIT), Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., 1979.

"Symposium: Milliken v. Bradley---." Wayne Law Review, March 1975.

Taeuber, Karl E., and Franklin D. Wilson. "The Demographic Impact of School Desegregation Policy," from Population Policy Analysis: Issues in American Politics, ed. by Michael E. Kraft and Mark Schneider. Lexington, Mass. and Toronto, Canada: Lexington Books, D. D. Heath and Co., 1978.

Taylor, William I. "The Supreme Court and School Litigation." Integrateducation, November-December 1977.

Texas Education Agency. A Guide to Better Inservice Education in Texas. 1982.

Texas Education Agency Plan for Meeting Requirements of Section G, Curriculum and Compensatory Education of Court Order, Civil Action No. 5281, Eastern District of Texas, Tyler, Division. 1971.

Theory Into Practice. "Desegregation: Plans and Possibilities." Vol. 17, February 1978.

Theory Into Practice. "Desegregation: Problems and Practices." Vol. 17, April 1978.

Tomkins, Rachel B. "Community Education and Planning - The Lessons from Other Cities," in Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, Citizen Guide to Desegregation. Cleveland: Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, February 1976.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Desegregating The Boston Public Schools: A Crisis in Civic Responsibility. Washington, D.C.: USCCR, August 1975.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Desegregation of the Nation's Public Schools: A Status Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, February 1979.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law: Desegregation of the Nation's Public Schools, No. 005-000-00141. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, August 1976.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans. Report VI: The Mexican American Education Study. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. With All Deliberate Speed: 1954-19??. Clearinghouse Publication 69, Washington, D.C., November 1981. ED 211 653.

Valverde, Leonard. "Strategies for the Advancement of Cultural Pluralism," Phi Delta Kappan, October 1978.

Van Camp, S. S. "A New Look at the Disadvantaged." The Urban Review, Agathon Press, Vol. 11, No. 3, 1979.

Vergon, Charles B. Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume VII: Desegregation Strategies and the Courts. Nashville, Tenn.: Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, April 1981.

Vines, Kenneth N. "Federal District Judges and Race Relations Cases in the South," from The Impact of Supreme Court Decisions: Empirical Studies, ed. by Theodore L. Becker. New York, London, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1969

von Euler, Mary. "Meeting the Courts' New Research Needs." Education and Urban Society, May 1977.

Walsh, J. "How Laws Express Social Values." East-West Center Magazine, Vol. 7, Winter-Spring 1978.

Washby, Stephen L. "Toward Impact Theory: An Inventory of Hypotheses," from The Impact of Supreme Court Decisions: Empirical Studies, Second Edition, ed. by Theodore L. Becker and Malcolm M. Feeley. New York, London, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Washby, Stephen L., Anthony A. D'Amato, and Rosemary Metrailer. Desegregation from Brown to Alexander. An Exploration of Supreme Court Strategies. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977.

Washington, K. R. "An Analysis of the Attitudes of Prospective White Teachers Toward the Inner-City Schools." ERIC Documents, 1968. ED 083 176.

Wayson, William W. "Good Multi-Racial and Multi-Ethnic Inservice Programs for Urban Schools." A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, February 22, 1975.

Weiler, Hans N. "Equal Protection, Legitimacy, and the Legalization of Education: The Role of the Federal Constitutional Court in West Germany." Paper, August 1981, presented at the Annual Meeting of the Americn Educational Research Association, New York, March 1982.

Weinberg, Meyer. Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume IV: A Practical Guide to Desegregation: Sources, Materials, and Contacts. Nashville, Tenn.: Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, April 1981.

Weinberg, Meyer. School Integration: A Comprehensive Classified Bibliography of 3,100 References. Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1967.

Weinberg, Meyer. Minority Students: A Research Appraisal. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977.

Weinberg, Meyer, ed. Research Review of Equal Education, Vol. I, No. 1, Winter 1977.

Weinberg, Meyer. "The Status of Desegregation in American Cities: Implications for the State Role." Research Review of Equal Education, Fall 1977.

Weinberg, Meyer, et al., ed. "The Law and Desegregation." Research Review of Equal Education, Vol. 2, No. 4, Fall 1978. ED 199 357.

West, John R. On What Basis Do Students Select Coursework in Black Studies?, ed. D. Practicum, Nova University, 1974.

Westbrook, John D. Considering the Research: What Makes an Effective School? Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1982.

Williams, Ben, and Carol Anderson. Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume VIII: State Strategies for Reducing Racial Isolation. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1982. ED 212 726.

Williams, B., and M. Rashman. "What the Courts Have Said about State Responsibility for School Desegregation." Legal Analysis, No. 4, September 1980.

Williams, David L., Jr. "Validation of Effective Staff Development/ Inservice Education Strategies." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Mass., April 7-11, 1980.

Willie, Charles V. "Racial Balance or Quality Education." School Review, May 1976, in Florence H. Levinsohn and Benjamin D. Wright, eds., School Desegregation: Shadow and Substance. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Willie, Charles V., and Susan L. Greenblath, eds. Community Politics and Educational Change: Ten School Systems Under Court Order. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, October 1981.

Willie, Charles V., Flores H. Levinsohn and Benjamin D. Wright, eds. School Desegregation: Shadow and Substance. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Wolfe, Christopher. "A Theory of U. S. Constitutional History." The Journal of Politics, May 1981. Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida.

Woock, Roger R. "Social Perspectives on Desegregation Policy and Research." Education and Urban Society, May 1977.

Wood, Fred H., and Steven R. Thompson. "Guidelines for Better Staff Development." Educational Leadership, February 1980.

Woodward, Bob, and Scott Armstrong. The Brethren: Inside the Supreme Court. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1979

Yarbrough, T. E. Judge Frank Johnson and Human Rights in Alabama. The University of Alabama Press, 1981.

Yarger, Sam J., et al. Creative Authority and Collaboration: A Collection of Position Papers, Inservice Teacher Education Report, IV. Syracuse, N.Y.: National Dissemination Center, Syracuse University, 1976.

Zlotnik, Marilyn S. Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume IX: School Desegregation Strategies: A Comprehensive Bibliography. Nashville, Tenn.: Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, April 1981.

Zigarmi, Patricia, et al. "Teachers' Preferences in and Perceptions of In-Service Education," Educational Leadership, April 1977.

F. APPENDICES

a. Project WISE Checklist

b. Table 4: Desegregation Techniques Used by Component and Grade Level

APPENDIX a.

CHECKLIST

School District

Name: _____

Superintendent: _____

Demographic Data:

I. Pupil opulation

a. Over 40,000 _____
b. 20,001 - 40,000 _____
c. 10,001 - 20,000 _____
d. Under 10,000 _____

II. Ethnic Composition

	%	Total
a. Black	_____	_____
b. White	_____	_____
c. Hispanic	_____	_____
d. Native American	_____	_____
e. Other	_____	_____
f. Total	_____	_____

III. Geographic Data

a. Urban _____
b. Rural _____
c. Suburban _____

IV. Type of Desegregation

a. Court-ordered _____
b. Consent Decree _____
c. Voluntary _____

V. Pupils Reassigned

	%	Total
a. Minority	_____	_____
b. Majority	_____	_____
c. % of Total	_____	_____

VI. Pupils Bused for Desegregation

	%	Total
a. Minority	_____	_____
b. Majority	_____	_____
c. % of Total	_____	_____

VII. Dates

Orders: _____

Plans: _____

Components	GRADE LEVELS		
	A. Elementary	B. Junior High/Middle School	C. High School
1. Student Reassignment			
2. Faculty Reassignment			
3. Reorganize grade structure (grade center, middle school, etc.)			
4. Busing for Desegregation			

117

CHECKLIST (cont'd)

School District: _____

Components	GRADE LEVELS		
	A. Elementary	B. Junior High/Middle School	C. High School
5. Multi-cultural Education			
6. Curricular (remedial, compensatory, vocational, bilingual, alternative, etc.)			
7. Magnet School			
8. Quality of Education			
9. Extracurricular (bands, drama, speech, clubs, sports, etc.)			

CHECKLIST (cont'd)

School District: .....

	GRADE LEVELS		
	A. Elementary	B. Junior High/Middle School	C. High School
10. Counseling			
11. Discipline			
12. Local Needs/Conditions			
13. Parent-Involvement or Community Relations			
14. Inservice			

School District .....

SUMMARY

OVERALL	EDUCATIONAL COMPONENTS

APPENDIX b.

TABLE 4

DESEGREGATION TECHNIQUES USED
BY COMPONENT AND GRADE LEVEL

4-A. Elementary

C-1 Student Reassignment	CO	DP	CD	Vol
(01) Change attendance zones	5	5		
(02) Pairing and/or clustering	4	4		
(03) Reassignment		4		
(04) Majority to minority transfer	2	3		
(05) Closing school	1	1		
(06) Magnet	2	2		
(07) Counseling minorities into high math and science courses				1
(08) Busing	1	1		
(09) Educational park	1	1		
(10) Grade centers	2	2		
C-2 Faculty Reassignment				
(01) Ratio assignment (as with "Singleton")	2	2		
(02) Reorganization of administrative structure	1	1		
C-3 Multi-cultural Education				
(01) Artists from community as resources		1		
(02) Every elementary teacher develops social studies course on human relations		1		
C-4 Curriculum (remedial, compensatory, vocational, bilingual, alternative, etc.)				
(01) Families (groups) of cross-grade learners		1		
(02) Oral language as basis for reading		1		
(03) University and (1) elementary school collaborate		1		
(04) Team-teaching		1		
(05) Individualized and small group approaches		1		
(06) Innovative materials		1		
(07) Arts in education program		1		
(08) Minimal use of conventional, routine methodology		1		

CO = Court order
DP = District plan
CD = Consent Decree
Vol= Voluntary

1-A. Elementary (cont'd)

C-4 Curriculum (cont'd)	CO	DP	CD	Vol
(09) Physical rather than sedentary learning		1		
(10) Enlarging oral vocabulary		1		
(11) Peer remedial		1		
(12) Resource room		1		
(13) Remedial program	1	1		
(14) Magnet courses to attract majority students		2		
(15) Title I		1		
C-5 Magnet School				
(01) (Court authorizes) school board to establish special focus magnet schools	1	1		
(02) Magnet school concept used to improve quality of education		1		
C-6 Quality of Education				
C-7 Extracurricular (bands, drama, speech, clubs, sports, etc.)				
(01) No racial barrier to any student in participating in any extracurricular activity	1			
C-8 Counseling				
C-9 Discipline				
C-10 Local Needs/Conditions				
C-11 Parent Involvement or Community Relations				
C-12 Inservice				
(01) Social studies		1		

4-B. Junior High/Middle Schools

C-1 Student Reassignment	CO	DP	CD	Vol
(01) Change attendance zones	3	2		
(02) Reassignment		1		
(03) Majority to minority transfer		2		
(04) Magnet	2	2		
(05) Construction of school		1		
(06) Busing		1		
(07) Grade centers	1	1		
(08) Alternative school	1			
C-2 Faculty Reassignment				
(01) Ratio assignment (as with "Singleton")	1	1		
(02) Reorganization of administrative structure		1		
C-3 Multi-cultural Education				
(01) Every secondary teacher participates in preparation of bibliographies and instructional materials on Blacks		1		
C-4 Curriculum				
(01) Minimal use of conventional, routine methodology		1		
(02) Physical rather than sedentary learning		1		
(03) Enlarging oral vocabulary		1		
C-5 Magnet School				
(01) Academic and performing arts program	1	1		
(02) Individualized instruction	1	1		
C-6 Quality of Education				
C-7 Extracurricular				
C-8 Counseling				
C-9 Discipline				
C-10 Local Needs/Conditions				
C-11 Parent Involvement or Community Relations				
C-12 Inservice				

4-C. High Schools

C-1 Student Reassignment	CO	DP	CD	Vol
(01) Change attendance zones		1		
(02) Pairing and/or clustering	1	2		
(03) Closing school	1	1		1
(04) Magnet	2	2		
(05) Construction of school		1		
(06) Grade centers	1	1		
(07) Alternative school		1		
C-2 Faculty Reassignment				
(01) Every secondary teacher participates in preparation of bibliographies and instructional materials on Blacks		1		
C-4 Curriculum				
(01) Gifted and talented		1		
(02) Computer and electronic technology courses		1		
(03) Cooperative education (including industrial, health, home economics)		1		
(04) New courses in jazz, rock and classical piano, and commercial art		1		
(05) Honors program in English, algebra, geometry, biology, and chemistry		1		
(06) Alternative high school		1		
(07) Needs assessment for remedial course		1		
C-5 Magnet School				
(01) Computer science center and medical technology	1	1		
(02) (Court authorizes) school board to establish special focus magnet school	1	1		
C-6 Quality of Education				
(01) Viable educational program will "greatly improve the quality of education"	1			
(02) Because of busing stipulated by circuit court, district submitted plan that it "did not deem educationally sound or financially feasible"; and though district and its attorneys "commit to cooperate...in promoting... educational program for the maximum educational advantage of all students in the district"		1		
(03) Arts in education to improve quality of education	1			

4-C. High Schools (cont'd)

C-7 Extracurricular	CO	DP	CD	Vol
(01) Recreational activities		1		
C-8 Counseling				
(01) "Guidance departments will begin to jointly plan revisions in the total guidance program"		1		
(02) Counseling of pupils and educational planning must be considered in regard to courses taken, grade level, and test scores		1		
(03) Counseling minorities into high math and science courses				1
C-9 Discipline				
C-10 Local Needs/Conditions				
C-11 Parent Involvement or Community Relations				
C-12 Inservice				

4-D. All Grade Levels

C-1 Student Reassignment	CO	DP	CD	Vol
(01) Change attendance zones	3	3		1
(02) Pairing and/or clustering	2	2		
(03) Reassignment	1	1		
(04) Majority to minority transfer				1
(05) Closing school	1	1		1
(06) Magnet		1		
(07) Free choice		1		
(08) Construction of school	1	1		
(09) Busing	7	7		
(10) Grade centers	1	3		
C-2 Faculty Reassignment				
(01) Ratio assignment (as with "Singleton")	4	4		
(02) Affirmative action and recruitment of minorities	2	2		
(03) Reorganization of administrative structure	1	1		
(04) Random reassignment		1		
Seniority as basic criterion	1	1		
C-3 Multi-cultural Education				
(01) Bilingual-bicultural				1
C-4 Curriculum				
(01) Achievement grouping (not tracking)		1		
(02) Minimal use of conventional, routine methodology				1
(03) English as second language		1		
C-5 Magnet School				
(01) Career development center offers vocational education for all students	1	1		
(02) Enriched daily schedule (recreation and P.E., parent involvement, accelerated programs in math, science, expository writing, and tutoring)		1		
C-6 Quality of Education				
(01) Viable educational program will "greatly improve the quality of education"		2		
(02) Lowered pupil-teacher ratio in desegregated classes		1		
(03) Quality of education is improved when the "arts are related to each other and to other disciplines," and when				

4-D. All Grade Levels (cont'd)

C-6 Quality of Education (cont'd)	CO	DP	CD	Vol
"arts are used to create learning situations which help reduce personal and racial isolation and increase self-esteem"		1		
(04) Because of busing stipulated by circuit court, district submitted plan that it "did not deem educationally sound or financially feasible"; and though district and its attorneys "commit to cooperate... in promoting...educational program for the maximum educational advantage of all students in the district"	1			
(05) Magnet school concept to improve quality of education		1		
(06) Remedy "must be imposed with a view toward maximum enhancement..."	1			
(07) Reorganization of the district "to provide a quality education for every student"		1		
(08) "Maintain an improved quality of education and level of consideration for all pupils"		2		
(09) Use of assistance of state and the district in achieving "present levels of "quality"		1		
C-7 Extracurricular				
(01) Special efforts in specialized areas...head coaches, band and choral directors, etc."		1		
(02) All extracurricular activities and facilities to be used on nondiscrimitory bases		1		
(03) No racial barrier to any student in participating in any extracurricular activity	1			
C-8 Counseling				
(01) Counsel minority students "with potential for higher achievement" to take higher math and science courses				1
(02) "To serve special needs and problems of Negro students"	1			
C-9 Discipline				
(01) Maintain order and discipline in all schools		1		

4-D. All Grade Levels (cont'd)

C-9 Discipline (cont'd)	CO	DP	CD	Vol
(02) Every student will have due process before suspension				1
(03) Minority students not to be disproportionately subject to disciplinary measures				1
(04) Suspension policies to confirm with Goss v. Lopez				1
(05) Equal and uniform throughout the district				1
C-10 Local Needs/Conditions				
(01) "There is community apprehension"	1			
(02) Plan formulated by taking into consideration the "rights, needs and desires of all segments of the community"		1		
(03) Tri-ethnic committee	1	2		1
(04) Bi-racial committee	1	3		
(05) Provision for adaptations to changes in population (numbers, mobility)	1	1		
C-11 Parent Involvement or Community Relations				
(01) Tri-ethnic committee	2	2		
(02) Bi-racial committee	3	3		
(03) Court feels "there is substantial community support for school system; no violence or boycotts"	1			
(04) "If the parties to this lawsuit and the people of [the community] will take a positive and constructive attitude toward this necessary process of desegregation, it can be...."	1			
(05) School will have a director of public relations responsible for informing community of the plan and the progress....	1	1		
(06) Parents may be offered an orientation at their children's schools where they may meet staff		1		
(07) Public meetings to review zoning and hear protests or comments				1
(08) Committee to discuss general framework....	1	1		
(09) CO includes sections of U.S. code on obstruction of justice and violation of rights in enrolling in public schools or college	1			

4-D. All Grade Levels (cont'd)

C-11 Parent Involvement or Community Relations (cont'd)	CO	DP	CD	Vol
(13) Family homework policy		1		
(14) "Concerns of citizenry" (noted by judge) about safety of children	1			
C-12 Inservice				
(01) Human relations training	1	2		
(02) Training in cultural awareness, stereotyping, race relations		2		
(03) Training for evaluation and use of multiethnic materials		2		
(04) Orientation for desegregation		1	1	
(05) Training to implement desegregation			1	